THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Bishop of Chichester, the Right Rev. G. K. A. BELL, is widely known and respected for his keen intelligence and his breadth of outlook and sympathy, and his recent book, *The Church and Humanity, 1939–1946*,[1] will be welcome in many parts of the Christian world. Its contents include some speeches made in the House of Lords on crucial issues (often the target of criticism) and also some sermons on public issues. There is a certain unity to be found in these various utterances due on the one hand to a deep concern the speaker felt for the future of Europe and on the other to a profound conviction that only a spiritual faith will secure its recovery.

Dr. BELL urges strongly that the Church is not a universal boudoir where people meet and take their ease and keep their minds away from serious things, but a militant force fighting ceaselessly against evil, against the narrow selfishness of nations, against the idolatry of wealth, against the passive acceptance of gross social evils, against the bitter nationalism which sets people against people, against every totalitarianism that enslaves the souls of men. These evils are so rank and powerful that they can only be defeated by a concentration of spiritual forces against them. They have such a terrifying strength that the *whole Church* must be in arms against them.

One great weakness of the Church is that it is regarded (by its own members) as a collection of churches each of which runs a lonely and selfish race against the others. We have not seen the indispensable need for combined action. The revolution that is needed in our thinking is this, that we must see that the evils in our time are too dangerous, too powerful, for the Church to be divisible. Something has been done already in a small degree towards the cure of this by way of commencement.

[1] Longmans; 8s. 6d. net.

There are roughly three forms in which the movement for closer world-wide Christian unity has found expression. In the first instance, there are those whose aim is directed to organic unity, or, at least, inter-communion between the churches. They desire one great Church in which agreement on doctrine is a *sine qua non*, and the ministers of every section are recognized universally. This part of the movement is known as *Faith and Order*. It was founded before the last war and has held two great Conferences, at Lausanne and Edinburgh.

The second form leaves organic unity entirely on one side. It aims at securing unity in Christian practice on the basis that while each Church remains loyal to its own tradition and religious experience, all the churches can stand together on a common ground in social and international affairs, and help to bring the Christian conscience to bear on current problems with a united witness. This part of the movement is called *Life and Work*. It was founded as a result of the last War for the purpose of bringing the churches together as they are and persuading them to create a united Christian front to grapple with the urgent social questions. It owes its origin to a great Swedish Churchman, Nathan Söderblom, and has gathered delegates from most of the non-Roman churches to two great Conferences at Stockholm and Oxford.

Both these movements are now working together as partners in a permanent body called *The World Council of Churches*, whose object is to facilitate common action by the churches and to help all the churches to realize themselves as elements in the Church Universal.

But there is now a third movement which is only just commencing, dealing again with the international and the social field. It is a movement in which the Roman Catholics in England and in certain other countries have joined, with the encouragement and sanction of the Pope,

showing for the first time a readiness to co-operate on equal terms with Christians of other communions. There is hope in this movement but it must be realized that all issues relating to organic unity or dogmatic questions of worship, creed, and ministry are excluded. It is co-operation not unity that is sought.

These things are evidence that there is already a breeze stirring in different quarters within the Church. A thousand years in God's sight are but as one day. So with a thousand churches. God sees them as parts of a single world-wide Christian front. And we are beginning to see this too. What, then, is the task before this Christian body? It concerns the future of Europe. 'The great task on which thoughtful men of all complexions should unite is the making of unity in Europe,' writes Dr. BELL. 'We have to recover Europe, and the spirit of Europe, and to rise above the divisions, whether they be of nations, or blocs or parties.'

There are many factors which make the realization of European unity difficult to-day. But the chief obstacle is spiritual, a profound distrust of nation for nation, party for party, and citizen for citizen, together with an increasing moral disintegration. In order therefore to rebuild the underlying European unity, we must go beyond politics. 'I suggest,' writes Dr. BELL, 'that we are more likely to achieve the goal of European unity if we build on the culture which all European peoples have in common. The peoples of Europe all possess a common form of culture, based on four common spiritual traditions.'

There is the humanist tradition, which lies behind the literary and intellectual culture of the educated classes and is largely responsible for the liberal and humanitarian element in our civilization. There is the scientific tradition, perhaps the clearest example of the part played by individual collaboration in European culture. There is the tradition of law and government which, while naturally more affected by national political divisions, possesses important common elements which distinguish European from Asiatic society. Lastly, there is the Christian religion which provided the original bond of unity between European peoples and has influenced every part of Europe and every section of European society.

All these traditions are important, but it is the last which is not only the most important but also the most potentially unifying of them all. Few will deny—and the fact has been constantly affirmed to-day—that of all the crises in which we are involved the spiritual crisis is the gravest. There is a profound sense of frustration and despair; there is not only a material but a moral disintegration. Without a recovery of purpose, without a restoration of hope, the dissolution of European culture is inevitable. The fundamental menace to our civilization is not Communism but Nihilism—the attitude of destruction and negation which calls evil good and good evil.

Against this the one essential force is the spiritual. As Lord Samuel said in the House of Lords, the best charters and constitutions are of little avail without religion. And it will hardly be disputed that when we speak of religion in Europe it must be the Christian religion with which we have to deal. There are two facts which emphasize the significance of Christianity as a great unifying force for Europe, one permanent, the other bound up with our contemporary situation.

The permanent fact is that in spite of the divisions between Roman Catholic and Orthodox in the eleventh century, and between Roman Catholics and Protestants in the sixteenth century, and in spite of the deep differences in the dogmatic field, there is still such a thing as a common Christian faith. The contemporary fact is that throughout the World War the churches have been the most determined adversaries of Nazism. All over Europe there is a network of organized Christian bodies giving witness to those fundamental rights and liberties without which European civilization cannot continue. This is the encouraging factor for the future of Europe. The springs of recovery lie in the spiritual zone, and believers and seers have a greater offering to make than engineers and technicians.

The Bishop of Southampton, the Right Rev. E. R. MORGAN, has written a useful and timely book under the title, *The Mission of the Church*.[1] He calls it a 'Commentary' on the nature of the Church's mission, and he claims for it no originality. But it is so discerning a 'Commentary' that the matters it deals with shine often in a new and fresh light.

Says the author at the outset: 'A sense of mission cannot be claimed as the exclusive possession of the Church. Few things were more baffling to the faith of Christians in the years

[1] Geoffrey Bles; 6s. net.

immediately before 1939 than their own sense of frustration in face of the dynamic ardours of Fascism, National Socialism, and Communism. These movements claimed to have a mission, the immediate purpose of which was to sweep away an outworn and degenerate order of society, and establish a new order in its place. Inasmuch as the old order had been associated with Christianity this was a claim to supersede Christendom.'

The questions that accordingly arise in the Christian mind are questions concerning the Church's mission. What is its nature ? On what is it founded ? What is its driving force ? And the answers here offered are that the Church's mission is to overcome the spirit of Anti-Christ, and that the *raison d'être* of it and its driving force is faith in the Presence of the Ascended Lord.

The pages that follow are elaborations of those answers. The mission of the Church is set forth as derived from that of the Son, and as enabled by the mission of the Holy Spirit. The truth which the Church proclaims is represented as in the Person, not the system ; it is the Truth of God revealed in Jesus Christ. The view of history on which the Church is based is affirmed to be the prophetic view ; the Church beholds the Righteousness of God revealed in Jesus Christ. But perhaps the *raison d'être* of the Church's mission is best expressed in terms of love ; it is to bear witness to the Love of God revealed in Jesus Christ.

Besides those conceptions of truth, history, and love there are others here treated, such as the Kingdom of God, the Civil Realm, the Body of Christ, the Last Things. On those conceptions also the author has usually something topical to say. But perhaps some will find the most useful part of the book in the concluding expositions of the relation of the Christian Church to Israel. The mission of Israel and that of the Christian Church are closely linked together. Our Lord, as is here said, intended His mission to be restricted to Israel until the Crucifixion and made world-wide after the Resurrection. Thus it was the task of the Apostles to launch the Church ' off the slipways of Judaism ' into the deep.

In the chapter entitled, ' The Gospel of the Ascension,' an attempt is made to convey something of the depth and penetration of St. John's interpretation of the origin and growth of the Christian Church. To St. John Judaism stands as the ' sinister symbol ' of resistance to the Divine Truth : even Nicodemus loved the night and darkness rather than the light. And he depicts with dramatic power the conflict between light and darkness, Christ and the world, the new order and the old. He does so with successive scenes of strife, suffering, death, and victory. On the other hand, over against the struggle ending in triumph, there is ' the abiding challenge of the Presence, awful and serene.'

If we are to understand the full meaning and motive power of the mission of the Church, we must recognize that these two themes—the ' now ' of the prophet who is afire with the challenge of the present, and the ' now ' of the mystic for whom only eternity is real—are in the Fourth Gospel quite unmistakably one. So Bishop MORGAN contends, and in this he would correct the common assumption that St. John is interested only in the mystical ' now.' He finds a tension in the Gospel between the suffering and struggling Christ and the Christ regnant and triumphant, but it is a tension ' embedded in reality.' The same tension constantly appears in the life of the Body of Christ, the Church, ' which is at once humiliated, frustrated and misunderstood, bearing about in it the dying of the Lord, and at the same time rejoicing in union with the Ascended Lord, and reigning with Him in glory.'

What then is the Church to be and to do in the world ? What is the content of its mission ? It has to worship Christ in His Ascended Presence and to behave in the way befitting that Presence. And what is it that the Presence commands ? Its message is, ' Go forth.' To do what ? we ask. And the answer is, To do all that Christ came down from heaven to do : ' to preach, to heal, to serve, to exercise the ministry of judgment and reconciliation, to bear witness, to make and baptize new disciples.'

The Unity of the New Testament.

The Kerygma.

By Professor A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., The University, Aberdeen.

As the author of a little book which bears the title of this series, I am delighted that the Editors of The Expository Times have invited some of our New Testament scholars to write on this subject. None is more timely or, I think, more important. If there is one feature in recent New Testament scholarship more striking than another it is the change of direction which is characterizing their books on the New Testament. Where in past decades the method had been analytical and 'centrifugal,' it is now becoming more and more synthetic and 'centripetal.' The scholars are leaving the circumference and are bent on the centre. They are concerned not to deny the diversity but to emphasize the unity of the New Testament. They are concerned to show that we have in the New Testament not many Gospels but one. You may mark this tendency in most of the important books on the New Testament published in the last decade or so: in C. H. Dodd's *Apostolic Preaching*, in Newton Flew's *Jesus and His Church*, in Vincent Taylor's trilogy on the Atonement, in Hoskyns' Commentary on *The Fourth Gospel*, and in many another. If a veteran scholar like E. F. Scott can publish a book with the title *The Varieties of New Testament Religion*, he is obviously the exception which proves the rule. The majority of us feel not that there is no diversity in the New Testament (for that is as plain as a pikestaff) but that the point has been laboured *ad nauseam*, and that the time is now ripe for demonstrating its unity.

I.

The particular aspect of the New Testament's unity on which I have been invited to write is the *Kerygma*. Strictly speaking, it is not my subject. One man in this country has made it his own, so that all of us, when we hear that rugged mouth-filling word, *kerygma*, think at once of C. H. Dodd's *Apostolic Preaching*. Beyond any doubt this is one of the finest contributions to New Testament science in our time, and you can hardly pick up a recent book on the New Testament which does not show somewhere its influence. What I have to say in this article will be largely inspired by that book.

What is the *kerygma*? *Keryssein*, the Greek verb from which it is derived, is one of the great New Testament verbs, occurring, in all, more than sixty times. *Keryssein* describes the function of a *keryx* or herald. (A modern equivalent would be 'town-crier' or, perhaps, 'announcer.') *Keryssein* means to proclaim with authority to all whom it may concern a message with which one has been entrusted. In our translations of the Bible 'preach' is the normal rendering, a rendering that is quite fit and proper so long as we remember that a great deal of what passes for preaching to-day could not by any stretch of imagination be called 'proclamation' in the New Testament sense. (I like the title of Professor J. S. Stewart's new book on preaching. *Heralds of God* reminds the preacher of his true task.)

From the verb comes the noun *kerygma*. This may mean either the act of proclamation or the thing proclaimed. The latter is the normal New Testament sense (*e.g.*, 'If Christ has not been raised, then is our *kerygma* vain'), and it is in this sense that we use it now. The *kerygma* is the thing —the message—proclaimed, and that message the coming into the world of God in Jesus Christ.

II.

In the beginning, it has been said, was the *kerygma*. Long before there was any written record of it, the Good News of God's mighty acts in Jesus Christ was being proclaimed in the world. For the earliest preachers, unlike many of their modern counterparts, were in no doubt about the essential content of the message entrusted to them. As P. T. Forsyth said years ago (and how modern Forsyth seems to some of us who are rediscovering him!): 'There was no universal theological formula, there was not an orthodoxy; but certainly there was a common Apostolic Gospel, a *kerygma*' (*The Principle of Authority*, 141). There should of course never have been any doubt about this, for we have St. Paul's explicit testimony to the same effect. In 1 Co $15^{3ff.}$, after summing up the evangelic 'tradition' which he had himself received (presumably at conversion), he concludes: 'Whether then it be I or they [Peter, James, and the others], it is in these terms that we preach and in these terms that you believed' (1 Co 15^{11}). Whatever differences Paul

had with the Jerusalem apostles, they certainly did not touch the substance of the common Apostolic Gospel. Here is the lie direct to those who assert that in the beginning there were not one but many Gospels.

Thanks to Professor Dodd and others we are now able to reconstruct the outline of that common Apostolic Gospel or *kerygma*. In this task of reconstruction we have two primary sources of information. First, there are the pre-Pauline elements in Paul's Epistles, passages where Paul expressly tells us that what he is quoting is 'tradition,' or passages where he is obviously expounding the common doctrine of the primitive Church. Among such passages let me instance Ro $1^{2f.}$ and 10^{9}, and 1 Co $11^{23ff.}$ and $15^{3ff.}$. In the second place, we have the early Apostolic sermons in Acts. Time was when scholars were content to dismiss these as the free compositions of St. Luke. Closer study of these and a new appreciation of the part played by Aramaic in evangelic origins have radically changed our view of them. And now, though few would claim that these speeches are verbatim reports of what Peter and the others said on these occasions, most scholars believe that they conserve very early Christian tradition, a tradition that has all the marks of having once existed in Aramaic. The clearest example is perhaps Peter's speech in Ac 10^{36-43}, a passage which has been called the *locus classicus* for the *kerygma*.

By comparing then these two sources we can say with tolerable certainty that the *kerygma* of the first 'heralds of God' must have run somewhat as follows:

The prophecies are fulfilled and the New Age has dawned.
The long-expected Messiah, born of David's line, has come.
He is Jesus of Nazareth who
did mighty works by God's power;
died for our sins;
rose again from the dead;
was exalted to God's right hand;
will come again as judge.
Therefore let all who hear this message repent and be baptized for the forgiveness of their sins.

This then was the message which the earliest preachers proclaimed. Whether they spoke of preaching the Reign of God or of preaching Christ, such in substance was their gospel.

Now the interesting thing is this (and here we are on one of the main roads to the unity of the New Testament) that the pattern of this *kerygma* is traceable through most of the New Testament. Like a song which keeps sounding in our heads in all manner of circumstances, we can hear the authentic notes of the *kerygma* ring out again and again in Gospel, Epistle, Homily, and Apocalypse.

Look first at the Gospels. 'The Gospels,' says Karl Ludwig Schmidt, 'in their literary peculiarity can only be explained from the early Christian *kerygma* as it is found both in the speeches of Acts and the Pauline letters' (*Theologische Blätter*, May, 1931). Indeed the earliest Gospel, Mark, is simply expanded *kerygma*. It begins, as the *kerygma* begins, with the fulfilment of prophecy (Mk $1^{2f.}$). Just as in Ac 10^{37} all 'began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached,' so Mark starts on the banks of Jordan and proceeds to relate how Jesus came into Galilee preaching the advent of God's reign ($1^{14f.}$). The following chapters in Mark (1^{16}–8) are an illustrated expansion of the *kerygma's* 'who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him' (Ac 10^{38}). Next, as in Ac 10, Mark goes on to record Jesus' doings 'both in the country of the Jews and Jerusalem.' The amount of space Mark devotes to the Passion Story (roughly one third of the whole) corresponds to the stress laid on the Cross in the *kerygma* of both Paul and Acts. Finally, after relating the death of Jesus, Mark relates, as the *kerygma* related, 'that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day' (1 Co 15^{4}). And if Mark's ending is lost (as most scholars hold), there is enough to show what the climax of the narrative was. Surely it is quite plain that Mark was following the pattern of the *kerygma*—retelling for the benefit of his Roman readers and with the help of many tales about Jesus which he had gathered from Peter and others, the same thrilling story of God's gracious intervention in Jesus the Messiah which was the theme of all the Apostolic preaching.

I need not here labour the proof that Matthew and Luke similarly reflect the pattern of the *kerygma*, for both these Gospels have Mark as their basis. It should be noted, however, that their inclusions of sayings from the document Q into the texture of their narratives somewhat blurs the clear outline of the *kerygma*. Further, the First and Third Evangelists tend to stress elements in it which are not so prominent in Mark, for example, the Davidic descent of Jesus (attested in the genealogies) and the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in the Gospel history (this latter being of course specially characteristic of St. Matthew).

The influence of the *kerygma* on the Fourth Gospel is quite indisputable but—and this is perhaps the important point—there is here a notable attempt to restate it in terms intelligible to a wider world. We think in particular of the *Logos* doctrine at the beginning and of the conception of Christ's Second Advent.

When we turn from the Gospels to the rest of the New Testament, it is possible to show how the

main elements of the Apostolic preaching have left their mark on the documents. The First Epistle of Peter, for example, is clearly indebted to the *kerygma*. So is the Epistle to the Hebrews, though here once again there is an attempt to restate it, the early Christian conception of the two ages giving place to the Platonic doctrine of the two worlds. Readers of Professor Dodd's recent Commentary on First John will remember the section in his introduction in which he clearly traces the debt of the Epistle to the earliest preaching. Nor is the book of Revelation any exception. 'The Apocalypse,' says Dr. Flew, 'is set in the framework of the primitive *kerygma*,' and indeed one need not read further than the first chapter to find most of its chief articles. The one book of the New Testament which seems to be an exception is the Epistle of James, for in it the name of Jesus occurs but twice, and we look in vain for that stress on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, conceived eschatologically as one great act of God, which marks the earliest proclamation of the gospel.

For the proof of all these statements I must refer the reader to the books I have already named. It is the conclusion to which they point which is important here, and that is not doubtful. *Through the variegated fabric of the New Testament, now clear and conspicuous, now veiled and hidden, runs the golden thread of the apostolic preaching.* Clearest of all in the early speeches of Acts, it crops up again and again in Paul's Epistles; it throbs through smaller letters like First Peter and First John; it controls the structure of the Gospels; and it reverberates through such different books as Hebrews and Revelation. There is a story told of the late John McNeill, the Scottish evangelist with the saving grace of humour, that being asked one day if he never took Jn 3^{16} as his text, he made the sound evangelic reply, 'Na, na! I have *that* in every sermon I preach.' So it is with the writers of the New Testament. Though they may never consciously allude to the Apostolic *kerygma*, it is there all the time, so to speak, in their Apostolic sub-consciousness; and again and again, if we have ears to hear it, it echoes and resounds in what they say and write. Here, then, amid the variety of the New Testament is one clear, strong strand of unity. It is the unity of men who 'continue steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine'

> To all alike proclaiming
> One Church, one Faith, one Lord.

III.

To this discussion of the *kerygma* I should like to append two observations, one theological and the other practical.

First, the *kerygma* which we have traced through the New Testament lived on in the Church. The Apostolic preaching was ultimately embalmed in the Apostles' Creed. Every student of divinity knows that there is no truth in the idea that the Apostles' Creed is the actual work of the Apostles. In its present form it dates back to the early fifth century. Nevertheless, the Creed is Apostolic in a true sense. It preserves the essential affirmations of the earliest Apostolic preaching. For what is the second article of the Creed but a revised and enlarged version of the *kerygma*:

> I believe . . .
> in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord;
> Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost;
> Born of the Virgin Mary;
> Suffered under Pontius Pilate;
> Was crucified, dead, and buried;
> He descended into hell;
> The third day He rose again from the dead;
> He ascended into heaven;
> And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty;
> From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

Gone perhaps is the emphasis on the fulfilment of prophecy which was a main plank in the earliest apostles' platform. There has been inserted a reference to the Virgin Birth (which apparently had no place in the *kerygma*), as also a reference to the Descent into Hades. (This latter found no place in the old Roman Creed which underlies the Apostles' Creed.) But in essentials, what we have in this main article of the Creed is none other than the earliest Apostolic preaching.

The other observation concerns our business of preaching the gospel to-day. What does it mean to preach the gospel? Dr. Walter Lowrie, writing of the dispatch of the 'apostles' two by two, makes the caustic comment: 'A good rule to-day if two men could be found to preach the same Gospel.' There are many versions of the gospel current in our world. Perhaps even yet the commonest version is that which Liberalism made popular. On this view, its essence may be summed up in the phrase 'the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man'; or, in B. W. Bacon's phrase, 'the paternalistic theism of the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer.' If this be the heart of the gospel, then we must admit that the earliest preachers went far astray. Not primarily in these terms did the first 'heralds of God' proclaim their message. The core and kernel of their message was the proclamation of the mighty acts of God in Jesus Christ crucified, risen and exalted, conceived as the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies. And surely any preaching to-day which aims to be in line with the original gospel must conserve the fundamental affirmations of the primitive *kerygma*. Like John

McNeill, he who would be faithful to-day to the earliest gospel must 'have the *kerygma* in every sermon he preaches.' Of course he cannot proclaim the Apostolic message in the precise terms in which the first apostles proclaimed it. The *milieu* of the preaching of the gospel to-day is altogether different; men's thought-forms and *Weltanschauung* have changed radically. The modern preacher must re-state 'the old, old story' in terms of the thoughts and ideas of to-day. He cannot, for example, use the argument from the Old Testament prophecies precisely as, say, the First Evangelist used it. But the argument is still valid and can be restated, as witness such a book as A. G. Hebert's *Throne of David*. Nor should this task of restatement daunt or defeat us. A very similar task confronted Paul, John, and the *Auctor ad Hebraeos* when they sought to commend the Faith to a wider world. If they succeeded, we can succeed too. And the modern preacher may be comforted in his task by the two-fold reflection that (1) man is still a sinner and desperately needs the gospel and (2) that the gospel, wherever it is truly preached, is still, as Paul found it, 'the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth.'

Literature.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Professor E. F. Scott's *Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (S.C.M.; 6s. net) is an excellent popular study of the Apostle's thought. All the characteristic features we have come to expect in his books are here exemplified: a clear and penetrating analysis, a singularly lucid style, an almost entire absence of quotations from other writers, no footnotes, and an eye for practical interests. The book is written with the conviction that, for all its ancient flavour and not infrequent obscurities of expression, the Epistle is essentially a modern writing which bears intimately upon the situation in which we find ourselves to-day.

After a brief chapter, in which Professor Scott explains the origin and purpose of the Epistle, an analysis of its several sections is given, followed by a treatment of its central teaching and permanent value. It is not enough, he claims, to say that the Apostle wished to put his teaching upon record for all time to come. He was writing with a definite situation in view; he wanted to remove ignorant prejudices which had been raised against him, all the more because he was about to undertake a mission to remote countries in the West. 'The whole Epistle is written around the theme that men have fundamentally the same nature, and the gospel has the same value for all mankind.' Nothing could be more mistaken than to think that Paul was a theorist who wanted to turn the gospel of action into a metaphysic.

The exposition is admirable. No one can read the book without being impressed with Paul's desire to present the gospel as God's answer to man's need, evoking the response of faith and accompanied by the transforming power of grace through the gift of the Spirit. Professor Scott sees Paul's main contention to be the claim that God has done for us what we have been trying vainly to do for ourselves. 'Why not forget ourselves and open our hearts without reserve to God's love and goodness? This, in the last resort, is what Paul means by faith.' The value of the Epistle for to-day is its complete relevance to our condition. 'We also have been proud of our wisdom, and in our reliance upon it have become fools.' 'Millions of people are repeating in their countless different ways Paul's cry of despair: "O wretched man that I am: who will deliver me from this body of death?"' Whether it be our consciousness that man is in bondage, our passion for righteousness, our new sense of the might of evil and sin, here is a writing which 'speaks to our condition,' especially because it is not only an exposure of need but also a triumphant exposition of the victorious power of faith in God. 'Our faith is anchored, not to any guess or speculation, but to something done by God in the sight of all the world.'

Enough has been said in this review to show that here is a book for the general reader and the preacher and student alike. Nothing but good can come to any group or reading circle which makes it a basis of study. In Professor Scott's hands the great Epistle, so often a regenerating power in the Church, again comes to life.

Vincent Taylor.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

Radoslav A. Tsanoff, a Bulgarian by birth and early nurture, who received his academic education in the United States, has been since 1914 Professor of Philosophy at the Rice Institute, Houston, Texas. Three major works now stand to his credit: the first on 'The Problem of Immortality,' the second on 'The Nature of Evil,' and the third —now under review—entitled *Religious Crossroads* (Dutton, New York [1942], Allen and Unwin [1947]; 15s. net). If the second is the most attractive of his works (it deals chiefly with the history and literature of the subject), this last is the most useful and likely to be of the most enduring value.

It is here cited under the heading of 'Philosophy

of Religion,' a phrase which if broadly understood conveys a more or less definite impression of its contents. For here we have studies in History of Religion (its beginnings, its growth, its 'recorded' forms), in Psychology of Religion (especially the phenomena of conversion, prayer, and mysticism), and in Metaphysics of Religion (especially the theistic arguments and questions of the Divine character and attributes). Special attention is paid to the Christian Scriptures and the leading Christian Doctrines. We welcome the two chapters on the Idea of Immortality and the Problem of Evil respectively, which at once summarize and carry forward the positions of the author's previous works. Indeed in this volume we get at once a conspectus of his mature thought and a text-book well worthy of recommendation to theological students.

The standpoint is not, however, such as would be acceptable to the most vocal and presumably most influential among the theological thinkers of the present day, in the English-speaking world at any rate. It gives too much value, they would say, to the religious achievement that lies outwith the Judaeo-Christian tradition; and, as they would also say, it involves interpretations of Christian faith that are too liberalist and humanistic. Be that as it may, it is a standpoint that is consistently maintained; and the book possesses also the merit of reflecting the mind of a sincere thinker, whose affinities and sympathies—as we should add—are undoubtedly Christian. He may not show much real independence of thought, but he is in close touch with the thinkers of whom he has learnt.

Three passages from the book will serve to give a good impression of both standpoint and style. Like many theistic believers of our time Dr. Tsanoff is of opinion that there is no coercive proof of God's existence and character, although of this there are 'convergent probabilities'; but he asks, How is religion to be explained and interpreted if there be no God? 'Just as in other fields of spiritual experience, so in religion, the very pursuit of value is a revelation of its reality, indubitable even though incomplete. Logical-scientific search after truth is itself, in insight, disclosure of real truth. The reality of beauty is foreshadowed in art, in the poetic activity itself. Moral values are convincingly expressed in the life of moral endeavour. So the aspiration after godliness, worship, reveals the Divine reality.'

In his discussion of the Problem of Evil Dr. Tsanoff in this as in his earlier work sets much store by what he calls the 'gradational view' of evil. What he tries to express may perhaps be gathered from this passage: 'In the gradational world of values . . . good or evil are [*sic*] not in the thing or state or position, but *in the direction* manifested. On any scale or ladder the step which we take may be a step up or a step down. So our every act is an ascent or a decline. Your life and mine are as radii in the Circle of Reality. As the Neoplatonists taught us, we may proceed Godward, toward the radiating centre, or we may be straying peripherally towards the outer darkness. An act that may be a blacksliding for a saint may mark the beginning in the reclamation of a sinner. The important thing is which way the person is turning.' It is not, of course, that there is no radical difference between good and evil; on the contrary, there can be no more radical difference or opposition than that of direction. Evil lies in the betrayal of the higher choice.

At the close of the work Dr. Tsanoff seeks to define the right Christian position in relation to modern thought and life. The appeal of the Christian Church should not be, he says, in terms of dogmatic formulas, sacramental ritual, and ecclesiastical order; if it is to be a saving appeal, it must be 'Christ's own vision of the infinitely precious soul of man, His revelation of fatherly and brotherly love as God's word to men, the salvation of men in Him through each other. On these truths all Christians can unite, and these truths Christianity can and should teach to this modern world of technology, science and philosophy.' W. FULTON.

THE NEW MODERNISM.

Professor Cornelius Van Til, Th.M., Ph.D., of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, U.S.A., offers a new appraisal of the theology of Barth and Brunner in a substantial volume with the somewhat surprising title of *The New Modernism* (James Clarke; 20s. net). The first five chapters investigate the philosophical and epistemological presuppositions of the Crisis Theology. This is followed by eight chapters of very fully documented exposition, showing how the positions of Barth and Brunner are controlled by these presuppositions, and how therefore their claim to be true servants of the classical Reformed Faith is without any real foundation.

Dr. Van Til's thesis may be briefly stated as follows. Both Barth and Brunner sought to escape from the critically motived theology of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. That theology with its historical relativism and psychological subjectivism fails to be a right theology of the Word and Revelation of God. But in spite of all their protesting against these 'consciousness theologians' Barth and Brunner never departed from the critical ideology of those teachers who nurtured them. In the last resort they with their teachers stand in the tradition, philosophically, of Kant's 'Critique of Pure Reason.' And, dogmatically, this means that though Barth and Brunner profess a theology of transcendence, the self-contained 'Otherness' of God, they never truly get away from the wholly immanent God of the 'consciousness theologians.' They are liberals, critical modernists, subjective; and, though they use the form of words, sceptical with regard to the content of the historic Faith. Barth's 'Romans,' for example, is built upon the same principle as that on which Schleiermacher wrote his 'Christian Faith.' What we have in short is anti-metaphysical theology which leans over into a refined pragmatism. The result is that autonomous man is put into the centre once more, and God as

ultimate Being becomes now a limiting conception by which the individual eternalizes his self-chosen ideals.

With this analysis of the controlling background Dr. Van Til proceeds by means of a long exposition to find justification for his view in the various texts of the two theologians. Apart from his interpretation he has done a very useful service for students by providing from many sources (many of which are not yet available in English) such an abundance of quotations. The conclusion at which Dr. Van Til arrives may be expressed in his own summary : ' Nothing could be more untrue to history than to say that the theology of Barth and Brunner is basically similar to that of Luther and Calvin. A Calvinist should not object to the Lutheranism in Barth ; there is no Lutheranism there. A Lutheran should not object to the Calvinism in Barth ; there is no Calvinism there. A Reformation theology reconstructed along the lines of modern critical principles is not a Reformation theology in any form ! '

One need not hold any brief for either Barth or Brunner in order to justify one's feeling that this is a very extreme book. It may well be that both Barth and Brunner stand in relations to their early theological training which they do not sufficiently recognize, but the fact is that they would have no interest in sponsoring the kind of theology Dr. Van Til sees them hopelessly proclaiming. Nobody will be more astonished than Barth to learn that after all he is no more than a somewhat disorderly disciple of Kant ! Very much of Dr. Van Til's argument in this book is controlled by the complacent idea that orthodoxy can ' by-pass ' the whole of the critical movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This is the difference between him and the Crisis theologians : they take criticism seriously and wish to use it to find anew what is abiding in the tradition. The alternative is Fundamentalism which appears on the whole to be the standpoint of this book. But even Calvin in his ' Institutes ' is already feeling that there can be no resting-place therein. His doctrine of the witness of the Spirit did imply both a breach with tradition and a call upon tradition to renew itself through critical self-reflection. In spite then of the learning, and the great diligence which this book represents, methinks it protests too much to be a sound guide in the debate.

J. Macleod.

THE PREACHING OF JOHN CALVIN.

Few men have had an influence as deep and widespread as Calvin. That, whether they like it or do not, every one acknowledges. But few realize how many-sided was, and is, that influence he wielded and still wields. Is it not, for example, apt to be forgotten how certainly he holds a foremost place among the Church's preachers down the ages ; and how markedly and permanently his original mind told upon, and changed, the pulpit methods that he found, making them obsolete, and forming and fixing others that have lasted to this day. The style of preaching with which we are familiar is, largely, the creation of John Calvin.

Books upon Calvin as a preacher do exist. But they are really inaccessible to the ordinary man. And, therefore, we have cause to be grateful to the Rev. T. H. L. Parker for *The Oracles of God* : An Introduction to the Preaching of John Calvin (Lutterworth Press : 12s. 6d. net). The publishers deserve to be commended for this dignified and worthy book. Mr. Parker sets himself down as Assistant Curate of Luddesdown. But whatever be his office, he proves himself to be a scholarly man with ample knowledge, and a sane and balanced mind—except that he appears to have the quaintest notions of an evangelical—and commendable sobriety of judgment ; all which have gone to the making of a real contribution to the subject. Chapters on Preaching before Calvin, and on Calvin as Preacher end thus—' Abroad, in Switzerland, France, England, and Scotland his words had an almost apostolic authority—the whispers of this gasping preacher ' (for he was a martyr to asthma) ' had (to borrow a phrase from John Buchan) the authority of trumpets.'

Then comes the main portion of the work—a fine statement of the awe-inspiring Calvinist conception of what preaching means and is ; a vivid study of his methods and style in the pulpit ; and, best of all, an impressive summary of Calvin's gospel. More sheer nonsense is talked about this man than about almost any one in history. If these traducers, confident in their ignorance, could be induced to read these careful and discriminating twenty-seven pages, light might break in upon their minds.

Then comes a very interesting and informing chapter on his Influence on English Preaching. And, finally, a much needed Recall to the Fundamentals, addressed to the preachers of to-day. And, so, with some scholarly appendices, the book takes end. It is unfortunate that the specimen sermon given us is far from showing the man at his best. But a great preacher, beyond doubt, he was. Mr. Parker's comments on him are both shrewd and true. ' The greatest writer of the sixteenth century,' Edward Dowden called him. Yet, explains Mr. Parker, ' his greatness lies in his consistency and clarity, for he walks and rarely soars.' That is well said. Or, again, ' Even an enemy called him, while he was still in his twenties, the most learned man in Europe ; but his learning is so well hidden that one might hear him preach for a month without suspecting that he had read any book other than the Bible.' That, too, is accurate. For his studies were all hidden away in the background of his preaching. A man of infinite humour and witty conversation, he rarely used it in the pulpit, as was the custom of the time, but was grave and awed. And that one can commend. But far more damaging is Mr. Parker's admission that, as a preacher, he lacked imagination, and had small skill in adjectives, using a lean and austere prose. Which fact, for fact it is, would seem to rob him of the very highest honours. Yet enough remains as his inalienable possession. ' Where nearly all Calvin's contemporaries may be

said to belong to the late Middle Ages, he himself is essentially a member as well as a creator of the modern world. If he is compared as a preacher with Latimer or Luther, there might seem to be a century between them. His habit of mind was modern, and it shows itself in his preaching; so that A. M. Fairbairn can say: Modern oratory may be said to begin with him, and indeed to be his creation.' Or, as Mr. Parker himself sums the matter up: 'Calvin's style has prevailed. By the end of the seventeenth century most preachers, whether they knew it or not, were Calvinists in their prose style. Alone among his contemporaries, Calvin writes and preaches in the modern style. He was, in fact, the first great modern preacher. English preachers since the end of the seventeenth century who, in theology have differed fundamentally from him, have yet to a large extent owed their style to him. English preaching has been indebted to Calvin to a degree which has never been acknowledged, because it has been unrealized.'

A. J. Gossip.

MATHEMATICS AND RELIGIOUS METAPHYSICS.

It must be doubtful to those who believe in God through Jesus Christ whether there is any religious interest in the Five Ways or proofs of the existence of God given by Thomas Aquinas. They are the subject of this curious little book—*Space and Spirit* (Nelson; 6s. net)—by Sir Edmund Whittaker, F.R.S., who, however, himself says 'a purely metaphysical proof of the existence of God is of little value for apologetics, since most men will always be more ready to believe in God than to believe in any system of metaphysics.

Sir Edmund discusses the bearing of modern physics on the arguments based on ideas about a prime mover and causality and design. The quantum theory seems to explode the belief in the necessity of a cause, the time of the break-up of radium atoms being according to it not merely in fact but in principle unpredictable. On the other hand astronomy points to some sort of origin or creation of the universe as we know it having taken place between one and ten thousand million years ago and there are even certain features of the physical universe that may be related to time as measured from that point as zero. And the existence of such a zero point would amount to a proof that as far as the cosmos we know is concerned its Creator is transcendent not merely immanent.

The writing is elegant, clear, compact, worthy of the great authority of its author. A larger statement might easily become wordy and boring. Yet on the other hand it is difficult to feel the mind being nourished by so rapid a treatment of the vast theme.

R. W. Stewart.

The Gospel in India, by the Rev. W. E. French (Carey Press; 6s. net), a Baptist missionary who has spent the whole of his missionary life in Bengal, tells of all the Baptist Missions in India. These are established at centres so varied both in their location and in the types of people they work among, that the book actually deals with a considerable cross-section of the amazing variety that is India. Thus its range extends from the life of cities like Delhi and Calcutta with their Hindu and Muslim populations to aboriginal hill peoples like the Konds and the Lushais, who have emerged directly from animism. Its story is of slow progress in many places and of rapid transformations in others of head-hunters into stable and self-propagating Christian churches. At Serampore there is, of course, the Theological College which grants B.D. degrees to Christian students from all over India—and even an occasional D.D. degree as well. In the Lushai Hills the Welsh Presbyterians have evangelized the northern province and the Baptists the southern one, but now the whole Lushai Church is one, and those in full membership in either area are full members of the whole Church. Referring to this achievement Mr. French says, 'It is only by a continued expansion of such team work that the tremendous task in India can adequately be faced.' This book tells a fine story of growth, sometimes rapid, sometimes slow, but never faint-hearted.

It is a pleasant sign of a wholesome interest in the past that the Carey Press count it worth while to re-issue after eight years the Rev. Ernest A. Payne's account of some outstanding figures in Baptist Missionary circles in the latter half of last century, a little book called *The Great Succession* (3s. 6d. net). It brings quietly home to the reader with what heroism and diligence and scholarship the Baptist Mission was served at home and abroad in that period by men whose names and labours should not be forgotten. One fact shown though not stressed in the book is how constantly and irresistibly missionaries with the fervent evangelical background characteristic of their denomination were constrained to occupy themselves with the wider social and cultural interests of Christian civilization, with education and literature in general as well as with Bible translation.

There is little doubt that *Intelligent Prayer*, by Lewis Maclachlan, M.A. (James Clarke; 2s. 6d. net), is likely to appeal to many minds. Is there not, for proof of that, a commendatory Foreword by Professor Grensted? But, as it happens, in the main, it does not much help one particular reader. It consists of twenty-three very short chapters, of from three to five pages, in which very real problems of life and faith and prayer are faced, and an answer to each quickly and confidently given. It is all lucid and simple and assured. But, for some, the answers are too easy, and the problems left still unresolved. Indeed, for such, in their stupidity, more questions are raised than are answered. None the less, this little book will win its own circle of readers. There is much space given to the healing of the sick through prayer. There are also wise counsels

on How to deal with our own Faults, and on How to intercede for the Sick in Soul.

The story of the London East End Mission is told in *These My Brethren*, by R. G. Burnett (Epworth Press; 5s. net). It is an inspiring chronicle. The War did its best to silence this voice of compassion and help, but the work still goes on and still has its 'triumphs of grace.' This record will appeal primarily to Londoners, but it should carry inspiration to all who value devotion to a great cause. The first chapter is headed 'War Comes to Stepney,' and tells of apparent disaster. The last is headed 'The Best is Yet to Be,' and reveals the spirit in which the Mission has been run, and the faith that upholds its workers.

None Other Name (Epworth Press; 5s. net), by the Rev. Ian Macpherson, is a volume of sermons by one who has already made a successful venture in this field of publication. The sermon that gives the title to the whole volume is a thoughtful presentation of the truth that there is no substitute for Jesus, because in Him we encounter the challenge of the moral ultimate, in Him we are confronted with the inescapability of the infinite, for Him is reserved the royal prerogative of pardon, and in Him we discover the sole originator and dispenser of spiritual life. The style throughout is simple, pointed, and direct, and there are many illustrative instances.

Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have re-issued the late Rev. Dr. G. Campbell Morgan's fluent and rhetorical commentary entitled *The Teaching of Christ* (10s. net).

What Saith the Scripture?, by the Rev. C. F. Hogg (Pickering & Inglis; 10s. net), answers two hundred questions 'of interpretation, faith and practice.' Questions of faith are such as refer to the Second Coming. Questions of interpretation are such as is suggested by 'we see through a glass darkly'—what is the glass? Questions of practice are, for example, Should the Christian be guided by his own conscience or by that of others? Or even, What is the best time for the bag or basket to be passed round on the Lord's Day morning? The book may be not only interesting but helpful, though, as the jacket suggests, you may not always accept the author's solution of his problems. But you can hardly fail to find here questions that have been problems for yourself.

How does God's grace come to the help of a needy soul? Does it simply act towards it on the analogy of the moral uplift that can come to us from the influence of others round about us? Or does it also act within it? And, if the latter, how can it so do, without impinging on the soul's moral responsibility, and violating its freedom? That is the vital question which the Rev. F. H Allen, M.A., B.D., asks himself in *God's Action within the Soul* (S.C.M.; 6s. net); and which he seeks to answer in that suggestive little book.

Mr. Allen is a born teacher. He has the capacity of dealing with abstruse subjects in clear-cut language, which any one can follow. Moreover, he gives the impression of an honest mind that means what it says, and that can say what it means. Staidly, soberly, step by step, he builds up his argument, without overstatement, till one feels about him what was said of a much bigger man, that one becomes conscious of a disinclination to disagree with him.

Facing the difficulties and objections, dealing with such matters as Absolutism, Freedom, Determinism, he advances to the position prophesied in his title, that God does act within the soul; and that that is man's sole hope; and so to a consideration of how He does so, without reducing men to the level of pawns upon a chess-board, under His hand. Here, for example, is a characteristic passage. A man hangs uncertainly between two possible choices. May not God bring to his recollection some factor which enables him to choose rightly. God acts within the soul. Yet there is no compulsion. It is for the man himself to attend to it or no. 'After all, if instead of God bringing the decisive factor to the man's recollection by a divine action within the soul a friend were to walk in and remind him of it by word of mouth there would be no question of coercion.' A little book to be commended.

Dr. E. R. Micklem's book, *The World's Ransom* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), is best described in his own illuminating metaphor of variations on a central theme. Just as a musical composer takes a theme, looks at it this way and that, turns it round and about, constantly receiving fresh illumination and showing us from different angles the beauties that have revealed themselves, so the author takes the gospel story and does something similar with it. He thought of calling his book 'Variations on the theme of the Four Evangelists,' and that is just what it is. His modesty held him back from this title because the great composers in their 'variations' had something new to say, whereas he 'can make no claim to be saying anything new.'

We cannot allow that, however. For if the truth he discourses on is as old as the Gospels his way of stating it makes it new to us. There is a freshness about all Dr. Micklem's writing which comes only from those who look at truth with their own eyes and make a discovery of it. Perhaps the best way of suggesting that is to say that Dr. Micklem constantly calls Dr. Glover to mind. Not that he owes his thoughts to Glover or to any one else, but that there is always an individuality and a spirit in his writing that makes what he writes vivid and interesting. And what he has to say is just what the Evangelists have said. Dr. Micklem takes the gospel narratives and turns them about until his 'variations' make them shine with a light that brings to us knowledge and renewal. A book by Dr. Micklem is a precious gift and this one has its own special and appealing treasure to bestow.

Evangelism and the Era of Atomic Power.

By the Archdeacon of Bodmin, Canon W. H. Rigg, D.D.

On 6th August 1945, the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima which devastated four square miles of that city in a moment. Soon afterwards, there followed the destruction of Nagasaki. Both these events profoundly shook the civilized world. This is not surprising, as the bombs dropped on Japan are estimated to have been equivalent to 20,000 tons of high explosive. Scientists believe that bombs can be made equivalent to 2,000,000 tons which could easily wipe out the whole of London in an incredibly short space of time. Whereas in past wars we have been spared the horrors of invasion, and under the shelter of our Navy have been able to improvise and train huge armies which, in conjunction with other nations, have overcome the Power that at the time threatened to dominate Europe, we shall no longer be able to rely on these advantages.

The use of the atomic bomb constitutes in the words of the Report of a Commission Appointed by the British Council of Churches on the Era of Atomic Power, 'a peculiar threat to the *urban* society, which is the outstanding characteristic of western civilization. In no country are the effects likely to be greater than in our own, which is the most highly urbanized community in the world. It is not only peculiarly vulnerable to attack, but the dispersal of the population and the burial of all essential industrial plants deep underground would be more difficult to carry out than in any other country of comparable international status, and such means of defence would be ineffective if our ports were put out of action.' [1]

The atomic age is a call to us that the eschatological aspect of Christ's teaching must engage our attention far more than has hitherto been the case. The sword of Damocles is hanging over our heads. What is there to prevent some Power pursuing, unbeknown to the rest of the world, its own researches in secret, for example, in Siberia, and at the same time protesting with every show of sincerity its love of world peace, and then suddenly launching an atomic bomb or bombs with deadly effect upon us or some other nation, which it regards as being in its way or threatening its own existence ?

Before 1914, for a generation at least, those in the vanguard of religious thought were becoming more and more impatient with what is called 'otherworldliness.' Some of us older men can remember the stir which Harnack's book, *What is Christianity ?*, made when it first saw the light of day. He summed up the essential teaching of Christianity under three headings :

> *First.* The Kingdom of God and its coming, the Kingdom of God being defined as the rule of the holy God in the hearts of individuals.
>
> *Secondly.* The Gospel is the Fatherhood of God applied to the whole of life. 'Jesus Christ was the first to bring the value of every human soul to light ; and what He did no one can any more undo.'
>
> *Thirdly.* The higher righteousness and the commandment of love.[2]

Many will be surprised at the serious omissions in Harnack's account. Little is said in his book about sin, but as Professor Emile Cammaerts said in addressing a joint conference of Educational Associations at King's College, London, on 2nd January of this year, 'Fifty years ago the world believed that man was fundamentally good ; that could not be said to-day. The world has seen in two wars what man can do, and had now to "debunk" the dogma of fundamental goodness.' [3] Harnack was, however, a deeply religious man and very much concerned about commending the Christian religion to the men of his own time.[4]

In 1906 a theological bomb-shell fell. A book was published by Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, with the sub-title, *Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Four years later an English translation was published under the

[1] *The Era of Atomic Power* (S.C.M., 1946), 15. This article owes much to this most valuable Report.

[2] *What is Christianity ?*[2] tr. T. B. Saunders, 51, 56, 67, 68, 70.

[3] Cf. the Report in *The Times* (Jan. 3, 1947).

[4] Yet Canon Roger Lloyd in his very brilliant but one-sided book, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century* (1946), i. 73, writes : 'For although on most things German and Anglican modernism differed widely, yet they were agreed that the humanitarian and ethical Christ which their researches seem to be producing was the Christ whom they wanted. Adolf von Harnack was the prophet of both, and his book, *What is Christianity ?*, answered the question virtually in terms of social reform, ethical training and political liberalism amid the cheers of the modernists all over Europe.' This makes us wonder whether the writer has read Harnack's book as it is so very unfair. Harnack firmly believed in the future life, 'a life that is bound up with death can have no meaning. It is only sophisms that blind us to this fact' are his words (p. 62). Besides this, in the section on the Resurrection, he states, 'On the conviction that Jesus lives we still base those hopes of citizenship in an eternal city which makes our earthly life worth living and tolerable' (p. 162).

title, '*The Quest of the Historical Jesus.*' The motive underlying Schweitzer's book was to show that with a few exceptions all the efforts made by the best historical methods available during the last hundred years or more pursued mainly by German theologians, had gone very much astray. Canon Roger Lloyd almost goes into ecstasies about Schweitzer's achievements and considers that the book has dealt a blow against Modernism from which it has never really recovered ; it is indeed an *enfant terrible* of Biblical criticism.[1] We need not be Modernists in the accepted sense of that much abused word to exclaim, *non cum tali auxilio !*

The purpose of this paper is neither an exposition nor a criticism of Schweitzer's views, but we believe that he has done a service to the Church in bringing home to her leaders that the eschatological aspect of Christ's teaching cannot possibly be ignored even though, like so many Continental critics, Schweitzer carries his views to an extreme regardless of other sides of the Lord's teaching. But it is highly significant that the emphasis laid upon the element of otherworldliness in the Gospel of Christ should come shortly before the two most terrible wars mankind has ever experienced, rendered all the more striking by the discovery of the atomic bomb just when peace was about to be declared.

Another very remarkable coincidence is that this universal feeling of dread is occurring at a time when men's minds are engrossed in, and awed by, the discoveries of science. How often the assertion has been made that we live in a scientific age ! The whole trend of our education has been away from the humanities towards a purely scientific training. Instead of singing 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow,' many people would leave out the word 'God' and substitute 'science' in its place. Now well-informed opinion, whether religious or not, is no longer inclined to sing the emended version of the doxology even though it may be too much to say that the old version has regained its former position. The actual truth is that science is neutral. On the one hand it may be used for beneficial purposes, for example the discovery of penicillin, or on the other hand it may be diverted to wrong ends, as a young man of twenty-three, who was under arrest, once said to me, 'Yes, sir, I am a burglar, but you must not think I am a Bill Sykes ; I do my work scientifically.' The drawback to a purely scientific training is that it encourages an attitude of mind which is impatient with the careful study of other sides of life not amenable to its own methods of investigation. Just when the prospect is being held out that by means of science the whole material well-being of mankind may be improved beyond the dreams of the most ardent social reformers, it is also threatened from the very same quarter with the possibility of destruction on a world-wide scale. This is a Divine judgment on the popular view that so far as the needs of mankind are concerned, religion is irrelevant. It seems as if God is saying to our generation, 'If you will, you may leave Me out. But the tree of human knowledge by itself will bring no Utopias upon earth, much less lead to Paradise which many of you deny. It is just as true as ever that the wages of sin is death.'

To give one more instance. The craving for security is occupying the attention of the leading statesmen of the world to-day as it has never done before. There is world insecurity. This is very natural after two world wars, especially now that war has become totalitarian, involving the entire civilian population. With the growth of a social conscience comes along the demand for social and individual security, namely, security in sickness and old age, security from want and unemployment. None of these securities is wrong in itself, and indeed this is an understatement for members of the Christian Church should take an active and intelligent part in forwarding them by all the means in their power. Yet the true Christian can never feel that he is secure. His ultimate security is not made by man but is in God's hands. Sooner or later in the case of each individual death overtakes him, and as Charles Spurgeon in his own epigrammatic way expressed it, 'only under His wings are curing and securing.' The discovery of the atomic bomb renders the whole of life more insecure than ever. This should throw us back on to the great truth of 'eternal life,' a present fact and a future hope. Judging from the occasional remarks passed by people in ordinary conversation about death, not nearly enough emphasis has been laid in our teaching upon the importance of this life being only a small part of the life which God has in store for each one of us.

There are two dangers which must be faced. First of all this picture of the future state is often imagined in such a way as to deprive it of all reality and relevance to present needs, so that to the ordinary person it possesses hardly any attraction at all. F. W. H. Myers once asked a church warden of (in his own opinion) the most immaculate orthodoxy what he supposed would happen to him after death. After much hesitation he reluctantly admitted that he supposed he would enter into eternal bliss, but he did wish Mr. Myers

[1] *op. cit.*, 74 ff. *Vide* the excellent article, 'Jesus and His Gospel,' by the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith in *The Modern Churchman*, Sept. 1946, esp. p. 165.

would not bring up such depressing topics.[1] The writers of the New Testament did not disdain to use the thought forms of their day in their description of the life beyond. Similarly we should not hesitate to follow in their footsteps provided that we retain the spirit of their teaching.

The second danger is that we may become so absorbed by the thoughts of the other world as to deny the clamant needs of the present. A parody of a well-known hymn expresses this attitude :

> Sit down, O men of God,
> His kingdom He will bring,
> Whenever it may please Him,
> You need not do a thing.

These words, however, are neither true to history nor to experience. With all the faults which have marred the witness of the Christian Church throughout the centuries, she has often been the pioneer of social advance and achievement. Such examples as the care of the suffering, and education of the young come readily to our minds. Strange to say, it may come to pass that the tables may be turned. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the rising generation may become so convinced that nothing will prevent the misuse of the atomic bomb from taking place in the near future that they may question the advisability of a long-term policy being worth the sacrifices which must be made to implement Mr. Butler's Education Bill or the rebuilding of some of our large cities which will take at least some ten or twenty years to accomplish. The true answer lies with the Christian Church which has experienced this tension. Her sons must not despise the things of earth, though they are not the most important. Education on the right lines does give better opportunities to the mass of our people to be the best God meant them to be. Likewise those of us who have worked in slum parishes can testify that bad housing conditions have proved themselves to be over and over again inimical to the spiritual life. Men and women have been so concerned with the struggle for existence that the higher side of their nature has been dwarfed and stunted. No work done for the sake of others, even though all outward signs of what has been accomplished should be swept away, is really lost. In a very real sense it is stored up in the heavens, being the expression of God's will having been done on earth as it is in heaven. Hence belief in the life to come must form a prominent part of our Evangelism both now and in the years which lie ahead.

[1] This story is related by F. C. S. Schiller in *Humanism*, 236.

Whenever the subject of the atomic bomb is brought up in conversation, at least nine people out of ten reply that this is no concern of theirs as they can do nothing about it, since the last word must rest entirely with the statesmen and diplomatists of the nations of the world. The Church must challenge this position, and boldly state that it does concern the average man. Whether she will gain the hearing of the people or no, she must, in dependence upon the Holy Spirit, declare the inner meaning of events.

Addressing herself primarily to her own members she must remind them of Christ's words, ' For their sakes I consecrate myself,' which should apply to all His disciples, but never more so than to-day. To dispel the cynical attitude towards life which is so prevalent, the importance of witness for Christ in the daily life cannot be overestimated, but by itself this is not enough ; it must be an intelligent witness able to distinguish between the essentials and non-essentials of the Christian faith, and still more to give good reasons for its truth. The youth of to-day is often puzzled and the middle-aged scornful, but the Christian must endeavour to understand the intellectual climate of his own time, and be so instructed as to be able to meet those who have lost their faith on their own ground. Leaders and preachers alike need to be reminded that the appeal to the mind as well as to the heart must be made, couched in the simplest terms and avoiding all theological technicalities.

Constantly in the Old Testament the doctrine of the faithful remnant makes its appearance, and it may be, in answer to the obedience and prayers of Christ's faithful people, that the destructive consequences of the atomic bomb may be avoided, if so, not for the first time in her history the Church will have been allowed to save civilization.

Finally, we cannot view with unconcern the vast masses of people who pass by our churches, and never think of entering them from one year's end to another. They must be sought out as individuals, for the very signs of the times give an urgency to the words addressed to them. The note of warning must be sounded followed by words of encouragement. Apart from Christianity there is no hope in the world, and even if the worst should happen and our civilization be doomed, nothing can destroy the love of God in Christ and man's immortal soul and destiny, for the things which are seen are temporal, and at the best can only last for a time, but the things eternal are indestructible, out of the reach of the changes and chances of this mortal life.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

It Works!

By the Reverend Derrick Cuthbert, B.A., B.D., Birkdale, Southport.

'If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them.'—Jn 13^{17} (R.V.).

Henry Ford died the other day at the age of eighty-three. He was known throughout the world because of the motor cars which bear his name—'Tin Lizzies' they were called before you were born, but the nickname has been dropped in these days.

As a boy Henry Ford worked long hours every day upon the land, for his father was a farmer who had emigrated from Ireland to the United States. He disliked intensely the hard, grinding, uninteresting labour which was his lot, and when at the age of eleven he saw an engine for the first time—a portable steam engine which was used for sawing wood or threshing corn—he immediately asked himself, 'Why can't we use engines instead of human muscles to do more of this back-breaking farm work?' He became fired with the ambition to make suitable machines, and ran away from home when he was sixteen years old in order to take up employment at a factory where he could learn mechanical engineering.

The first vehicle he made was not a success. It was driven by steam produced by a paraffin-heated boiler. It worked after a fashion, but there was a constant danger of an explosion in the boiler and it was much too risky an affair altogether. So young Henry Ford began to build a vehicle that would be driven, not by steam, but by an internal combustion engine, that is, the kind of engine which drives motor cars, buses and aeroplanes to-day.

First he had to design the machine; then he had to get, or make, all the parts. For the wheels he decided to use bicycle wheels, fitted with heavy tyres, but the engine itself had to be made. Night after night he worked in a shed which he had fitted up as a workshop, and bit by bit the motor car that he had sketched out on paper began to take shape. At last, after months of labour, it was finished; a spidery-looking contraption, steered by a lever like a ship's tiller, with the engine under the seat at the back.

The design had been carried out; the ideas set down on paper had become a machine of steel and wire and rubber. But would it work? Henry Ford opened the doors of the shed, pushed out the car, and had a try. It *did* work! The engine spluttered into life, the wheels began to revolve, and the proud inventor was able to ride down the street in the first Ford car. Everybody was astonished. But nobody was more astonished than he. 'It actually works!' he cried.

This was in 1893. Thirty-eight years later the Ford Motor Company, which had its beginnings in an idea, a design, and a weird-looking car that worked, had produced no less than twenty million motor cars.

I listened the other day to a Labour Officer from one of the huge Ordnance Factories speaking about his experiences during the War. He said that he had had to carry out his duties under such pressure that, whenever any difficulties cropped up and the people under his care were not working together as they should, he simply did not have the time to go into all the ins and outs of the question with them. He had to use a shorter method of solving problems; a method which worked. Those of us who were listening to him leaned forward intently to hear what this method might be. He said, 'In other words, we had to use the Christian way.'

You and I, who are growing up in the Christian Church, have heard many, many lessons and sermons about the Christian way of life. We have been told about the duty of forgiveness, about speaking the truth, or dealing honestly with other people, and even doing a little bit more than is expected of us. I dare say we have said to ourselves, 'Yes! That is the right way to live. What a pleasant world this could be if only everyone were like that!' But I wonder whether that pleasanter world is slow in coming because we are all waiting for each other to make the first move in the way of kindness, and honesty, and love. I wonder, in fact, whether we are not rather like young Henry Ford at the point when he had finished the drawings of the car he planned to make. We have the design for a better life and a better world. But it will not make much difference if all we do is to spend our time looking at the design and saying, 'How neat! How beautiful!' We must make it take shape in what we say and what we do.

If we really try forgiveness and truthfulness and patience and service and all the rest—then perhaps some of us will get a shock. We shall discover—as the Labour Officer discovered—that they really work. They do overcome difficulties and problems; they do conquer meanness, spite and jealousy, and all the other evils that make life tawdry and miserable. Jesus has given us His teaching, not merely that we should applaud it and say, 'How right! How true!' but that we should live it. 'If ye know these things, blessed are ye *if ye do them*.'

The Liner and the Tugs.

By the Reverend L. J. Ballard, M.A., Harpenden.

'Who hath despised the day of small things?'—Zech 4^{10}.

The biggest ship in the world was in difficulty a short while ago, and nearly all our papers showed

pictures of the great liner which was stuck upon a ridge of shingle hidden in Southampton Water. Most people were surprised that such a thing could happen to a ship so finely made and so proudly serving as a link between the old world and the new.

When I was talking with some of the men whose work is with the ships that come in and out of the harbour, I was interested to learn two things about the misadventure of the *Queen Elizabeth*, and the happy ending of the trouble. Both things are worth remembering.

Only a small part of the ship, about one-tenth of its great length, was stuck upon the bank, but for all that, the ship could not move and all the great power of the engines inside could not help. Only one-tenth caught, but all the rest helpless! So it is with us sometimes. It may only be a little untruthfulness, or selfishness, or spite or temper, but it is a handicap which ruins service and confidence. One day we are caught out, trapped by the hidden bank. This is why we need the guidance of Jesus to pilot us past such dangers.

The other thing I learned was that the great ship was refloated with the help of little ships. In comparison with the liner a tug is a very small vessel, but the combined efforts of about twelve of them enabled the *Queen Elizabeth* to float again. On her painted sides were the marks made by the tugs as they pushed; it was their day. Though they would not be much use for an ocean crossing, they helped the liner which was made for that purpose. It is encouraging to think how much help can come from small things. Jesus was always on the look out for them. The little faith, small deeds of love, the boy's small lunch packet which Jesus used, the widow's offering of two mites, the giving of a cup of water in His name, these things which we often fail to do because they are so small are really the deeds which keep the great causes going, and Jesus will never despise the lowly or unseen service which is done for His sake.

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Snare of Worldliness.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'Love not the world.'—1 Jn 2^{15}.

What is this world which the Christian is forbidden to love? What it was for St. John is not in doubt. It was just the pagan society of the Roman Empire in the first century, with all its sensuality, materialism, and self-glorification. The world has changed since those days, for the activity of the Church has not gone for nothing. Yet he would be a bold man who would deny that the Church still stands over against a hostile world and that the world's values and motives can still be summed up all too aptly under the heading, 'the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life.' The world is human life as it organizes itself apart from God, or, to use a phrase of F. R. Barry's, it is 'a system of social relations wholly self-sufficient and self-centred.'

What, then, is worldliness? To define it as love of the world is true but hardly helpful, unless one goes on to discriminate between possible senses of that phrase. To forbid love of the world to the Christian cannot mean that in principle he is shut out from any sphere of human life, for Christianity is the religion of the Incarnation, and the Son of God by taking our human nature hallowed every sphere of human life. Family life, work, politics, recreation, and all the other normal experiences of humanity are therefore in principle open to the Christian. It is true that certain men and women have vocations which debar them from some of the spheres that are open to others. A David Livingstone dedicated to the service of Africa cannot be a politician or an industrialist. To give up his vocation and enter another career because it might be more remunerative would, for him, be a lapse into worldliness. But, setting aside such exceptional cases, the difference between the worldly and the unworldly man is not primarily a matter of a wider or narrower range of activity, but a matter of purpose and reference in all activities.

What makes a career worldly or unworldly is not the events of which it is composed but the purpose by which it is directed. A farmer is worldly who regards the land as so much material to be exploited and his farming as a money-making industry; a farmer is unworldly who regards farming as a part of man's stewardship of God's creation and a means whereby the land can be kept in good heart and sustenance be gained for his fellow-men, his dependents, and himself. It is the purpose and the Godward reference that make an activity unworldly. In Evelyn Underhill's words—'What is asked of us is not necessarily a great deal of time devoted to what we regard as spiritual things, but the constant offering of our wills to God, so that the practical duties which fill most of our days can become part of His order and be given spiritual worth.'

From another angle the difference between worldliness and unworldliness is largely a matter of priority. To seek God's Kingdom first is unworldliness, to seek 'all these things' first is worldliness. That is clear when it is personal wealth or fame that is at stake, but it is not so clear when one thinks of the stability or survival of civilizations. For example, governments are very willing to use the Church to maintain the morale of the people or to perform educational functions for the community's youth; but it is a lapse into worldliness if the Church allows itself to be used as a means to such human ends. That is a fatal fault in priority. With the Church it is God's ends that must come first and human ends only so far as they are subservient to His.

Again, it seems to-day a matter of priority that juvenile delinquency and broken marriages be checked so that society may be integrated and strong, or, to move into a wider sphere, it seems a matter of priority that a world-order be established to prevent another war and a lapse into chaos. The subtlety of the temptation lies in the fact that these things—world-order and a strong social life—are in line with God's purposes and should be sought, but not as first priority and not by any and every way. God is not a means to the attainment of these ends in this world, rather are they means to the attainment of His ends beyond this world; and His ends beyond this world are persons. Our Lord called men to follow Him and serve Him in God's purposes here and hereafter. He did not want men to follow Him because they hoped to draw from Him the power to save their country or to advance some other human purpose. The distorted aim of using and not serving Christ was perhaps the fundamental sin of Judas Iscariot. In short, worldliness or the love of the world which is forbidden is a wrong purpose and a wrong priority, springing from a lack of Godward reference, in men's activities and relations.

What, then, is the snare of worldliness? 'The world passeth away,' says St. John. That is true of the natural transiency of the material universe; but it is also true of that world which consists of human life organized apart from God. A system of social relations that neglects man's dependence on God and lapses into sensuality, materialism, and self-glorification is doomed. By its very nature it is self-destructive, because it is at cross-purposes with the will of God. To live in trust and obedience toward that holy will is to be rooted in the eternal world here and now, for 'the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.' All this, however, is far from obvious. The inherent self-destructiveness of godless civilizations does not leap to the eye. For generations they may look strong enough, and the rewards they offer may look satisfying enough. The snare of worldliness is just the deceptively enduring and satisfying appearance that the world presents to human eyes. But it is all a snare and a delusion, for the world, in every sense, passeth away. God and humanity redeemed in His Son—that is the final and enduring reality. Persons are immortal; the world is not. If we could only keep that true perspective we should escape the snare of worldliness.

How, then, shall we keep the true perspective? Dr. Gossip comments thus on an old poet's picture of the Day of Judgment: 'The sun has fallen from the heavens, the moon is darkened, all the stars are out; the only light streams from the Cross; and in that strange and ruddy glow how differently things look from what they used to do in mere deceptive sunshine. Before you make your choice of a life be certain you have seen things in the light of the Cross. For see how some that seemed so huge have shrunk to nothingness, and some you had thought insignificant have grown how vast! How this light changes everything! And it will be the only light upon the Day of Judgment!' To escape the snare of worldliness look often to the Cross.

When I survey the wondrous Cross,
On which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
And pour contempt on all my pride.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Humility of Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself.'—Ph 2^{8}.

Sir Ronald Storrs, who has given distinguished service to the British Empire, wrote his memoirs some time ago under the title, *Orientations*. In the course of his book he speaks appreciatively of Lord Milner under whom he served and for whose gifts he had a profound admiration. The thing which impressed Storrs most about Milner was that he carried his many distinctions lightly and that, though gifted far above the average, he had patience with and time for the average man. 'Milner,' says Storrs, 'was the first example I had met of the comforting truth that the greatest are also the most humble and the most kind, not only to their few equals, but also—and even more—to their innumerable inferiors.'

As Paul pondered the life of Jesus it was His essential humility, among other things, which impressed him. It may be profitable for us to consider this aspect of Jesus and its significance for all who profess to be His followers.

1. Jesus, so far as Paul was concerned, was God in human form—the Word become flesh. Believing that, Paul never ceased to be awed by the fact that, in order to save the world, Jesus should have laid aside the glory which was His and should have assumed a human frame with all the limitations it involved. Time and again he refers to this 'self-emptying' of Jesus as a thing which ought to be pondered by men who sometimes treat God and God's interest in them much too lightly. It was this 'self-emptying' of Jesus, this laying aside of His greatness for the sake of man, which stilled and quieted Paul's soul as he contemplated the final sacrifice of Jesus upon His cross—and what had stilled and quieted his own soul must, he was sure, still and quieten other men's souls could they be brought to see things as he saw them. He who was the greatest this world has seen had time for the lowest and the least and the last.

What was evident in the Incarnation and in the Crucifixion was equally evident, Paul knew, through all the years between. He who, though He was rich, became poor, who accepted the limitations of a human frame and finally became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, everywhere manifested a consideration for men

and a preparedness to serve them which none before Him had ever manifested. He had had time for individuals who were obscure and unknown. No one ever found himself turned empty away, and no one, while Jesus talked with him, felt that Jesus was growing impatient with him and was looking all the while for some one more interesting to whom to give Himself.

Some among whom He lived found Him difficult to understand. They had not been accustomed to see their acknowledged great men give their time and their gifts to any who asked of them, nor were they used to seeing them undertake menial tasks for others' comfort. That being so, they dismissed Him as of no consequence. But others were different. Because of this 'self-emptying' of Jesus, because of the time He gave to the obscure and unknown, and because of the services He rendered, they felt themselves to be in the presence of greatness. Paul was among such—and, in effect, confessed that it was this very 'self-emptying' of Jesus which won his heart and constrained him to follow Jesus wherever He might lead him.

In a world which has none too many of the Milner type, in which the standards of greatness accepted by Jesus' contemporaries are still accepted to some extent, it is difficult for some to see in Jesus Christ what the more discerning see. They pass Him by as One of little consequence, as One who, because He did not strut and pose and cry, as some alleged great men have been wont to do, may be safely ignored. But we feel ourselves to be in the presence of the greatest of all in the presence of Jesus Christ. We do not claim to have penetrated fully the mystery of the Incarnation and of the Crucifixion, but in both, we believe, God in Jesus Christ was active in our interest, and whenever we recollect Him who, though He was rich, became poor, that we, through His poverty, might be made rich, confess ourselves awed and quietened. He who had time for the least and the lowest and the last, we recollect, has time for us; He who gave freely to all who asked of Him is prepared to give as liberally to us; and He who became obedient unto death died for us as well as for others. The very thought of such things gives a new value to our life. How can we reckon ourselves or allow others to reckon us valueless for whom Jesus was prepared to die?

2. But if a consideration of Jesus' humility, of His 'self-emptying,' is necessary to a proper understanding of His greatness and of our incalculable indebtedness to Him, it is equally necessary if we are to understand our obligations as His followers.

Speaking to His disciples on an occasion on which ten of them were indignant with the remaining two because they had sought the chief positions when Jesus should come to His Kingdom, He declared that the prizes for which men spent themselves in the world in which their lot was cast were not the prizes He expected them to covet. 'Ye know,' He said, 'that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.'

It is easy to read such words and to forget them. We live in a world which still clings to the standards of greatness which Jesus' contemporaries accepted. James Adams, in his interesting book, *The Epic of America*, declares that, from a very early stage in the development of that continent, the one ambition of many of the settlers was to gain power and possessions. 'Apart from the excitement of the game, and the power and pleasures to be derived from wealth,' he says, 'a fortune, if made by one's self, became also a badge of personal merit in the eyes of the public, our only substitute for a peerage to mark the man of outstanding ability.' If some imagine that that is a phase of development which men in general, and we in this land in particular, have outgrown, let them turn to the *Life of J. A. Spender*, the distinguished editor of *The Westminster Gazette*, which was recently written by Mr. William Harris, the present editor of *The Spectator*. Mr. Asquith, the then Prime Minister, was anxious to confer an honour upon Spender, which the latter respectfully declined. Replying to his letter, Mr. Asquith declared that 'there is nothing which gives me so much trouble (or, I may add, such profound disgust) as the allocation of honours. . . . I am disposed to agree with you that it would be better that journalists should neither seek nor accept such distinctions; but that, unfortunately, is not the way of the world in which we live. The voracity for such things is so widespread and so shameless as to be incredible to any one who has not seen it at first hand.'

Living in that kind of world it is fatally easy to concentrate one's efforts upon securing all the accepted signs of greatness, to consider oneself successful in the measure in which one becomes wealthy or powerful or influential, to reckon one's talents and one's distinctions as one's right, and justification for dealing high-handedly and without consideration for one's fellows. So many people follow such a practice that we emulate their example before we know what we are about. But the word of Jesus still stands—that the greatest in His Kingdom are those who have a desire to serve and those who, whatever successes and distinctions come their way, carry them lightly and interpret them as further opportunities of assisting their less fortunate fellows. Not only does the word of Jesus stand, but the judgment of a man like Sir Ronald Storrs stands, that the greatest are the most humble and the most kind, not only to their few equals but also—and even more—to their innumerable inferiors.

Professor Lowes Dickinson in his book, *The Greek View of Life*, reminds us that, in the Greek view, 'to be a citizen of a state did not merely imply the payment of taxes, and the possession of a vote; it implied a direct and active co-operation in all the functions of civil and military life. A citizen was normally a soldier, a judge, and a member of the governing assembly; and all his

public duties he performed not by deputy, but in person. . . . direct personal service was the cardinal point—service in the field as well as in the council.' We have recently passed through a period in which the need of such direct personal service was emphasized and when he who rendered it was accounted great. The danger now is that we may think that what is so necessary in war is totally unnecessary in peace, and that we may revert to the standards of greatness which have brought such havoc and suffering to the world, each of us pursuing his own selfish aims and plans. Woe betide the various nations if such a line is taken! The only hope for the world is in discovering Jesus Christ's standards of values and ordering its life accordingly. Perhaps that is a discovery it can make only as it sees Jesus' standards lived out in the lives of His followers. And perhaps that is the service which we who profess to be Christians are called upon to render to the world in this day of crisis and of opportunity. 'Being found in fashion as a man,' said Paul, speaking of Jesus, 'he humbled himself.' 'What things were gain to me,' he said, speaking of himself, 'those I counted loss for Christ.' Once we have Paul's vision, it can only be a matter of time until we express Paul's resolve.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Mystery of the Missing Cubit.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?'—Mt 6^{27}.

The answer is that nobody can. Nobody can alter the unalterable. So why worry about it? Nevertheless, the missing cubit does appear to cause grave anxiety to many. Indeed, one glance at the newspaper advertisements brings evidence that the missing cubit, or the desire to add it on, to lengthen one's days, to increase one's height, to improve one's memory, to enhance one's charm or what not is a fertile source of revenue.

It looks as though the disciples themselves were worrying about some missing cubit. 'Which of you . . . ?' says Jesus to them. Were they beginning to worry about some cubit that was missing in the Master Himself? H. G. Wells said of Christ: 'He is too fine for me, not incarnate enough, not flesh enough, not earth enough.' Were the disciples beginning to see that, because of some missing cubit, the Master would never make a national leader? Or perhaps they were beginning to worry about His health. He would never stand the strain. 'The task which He had taken up was one which flesh and blood could not long survive.' The breaking-point was not far away. Tradition does say that He fainted on the way to Golgotha. Indeed, Dr. Maltby has worked out a very suggestive interpretation of the Cross on this basis.

Or were the disciples beginning to worry about the missing cubits in their own stature? Sometimes they did more than worry: they quarrelled as to which of them should be first in the Kingdom of God. Some of them were naturally quick-witted and far-seeing while others must sometimes have been humiliated by their own lack of understanding. Perhaps Jesus had overheard a discussion that had been going on among them. They may have been complaining of their lack of ability or of education or of means for the task before them. Some such situation as this may have lain behind these words of Jesus about the missing cubit. 'Which of you . . . ?'

(1) The cubits do count. Stature—not quite tall enough! Age—just a little too old! Eyesight—not quite good enough. Temperament—not quite of the required cast! Trivial matters, these, you might say, not worthy of mention. One policeman, one engine driver, one preacher the fewer—matters so little as to make no real difference. It is not the good of the individual but the good of the community that matters. I am not sure. As far as we know at present we can only pass through this world once, and it does stir one's sense of pity to think that any man, on his one and only journey through this life, should be denied his heart's desire and that by a little matter of a missing cubit.

What Jesus says about the missing cubit seems to be also true of mental endowments. There is nothing that we can do to increase our intellectual stature. William James pointed out in his talks to teachers that mental faculties like memory, concentration, reasoning power are fixed from birth and, although they may be trained and quickened, their original quality or amount cannot be altered.

What of one's moral stature? Does not Jesus believe in progress? Has there not been an adding, cubit by cubit, to man's moral stature since the days of His flesh? We would do well to note the wording of His question, so pertinent to the conditions to-day: 'Which of *you* . . . ?' What *man*? What of the man himself? Is man any better? It is very doubtful. We have more power, but have we the power to use our power? The test of progress lies not in how much we know, but in the use we make of our knowledge. 'Science,' says Mr. Bertrand Russell, 'has not given men more self-control, more power of discounting their passions.' In other words, there is no man who, by taking thought, by his own efforts, can add one cubit to his moral stature.

(2) What does Jesus say about the mystery of the missing cubit? We should not worry about it. Which of you 'by being anxious' (R.V.), 'by troubling about it' (Moffatt)? Whatever my shortcomings may be, it is just a matter of plain commonsense that I cannot improve matters by worrying, else I shall spoil the usefulness of the little I have.

The missing cubit always has its corresponding compensation. He lacked, by a little matter of a cubit, as it were, the sort of temperament for promotion in the Police Force, but that man became Pedr Hir, the Welsh poet-preacher.

Another lacked, by a missing cubit, the kind of eyesight for service as a first-class engine driver, but that man to-day is Harry Truman, the President of the U.S.A. 'Give me health and a day,' said yet another, 'and I will make the pomp of kings ridiculous.' He hardly did that, but he did write books including *English Traits* and *The Conduct of Life*. God never suffers you to be deprived of anything without giving you a chance of making up for it in some other way. Somewhere in your life there is a gift for which there would have been no room but for the place left vacant by some cubit that is missing.

(3) Jesus takes us into a world where the cubits do not count. In this world the missing cubits are the source of life's inequalities and of life's tragedies too. 'Which of you by taking thought can add . . . ?' Only too true. 'Unless above himself,' says Daniel, a man 'can erect himself, how poor a thing is man.' That is what Jesus implied. But how and wherewith shall a man raise himself? With something in himself? That, said James Ward, would be like stepping into a bucket in order to lift it. Archimedes used to say that if only he could find a point outside the world on which to rest his lever, he could lift the world. That, if I may compare a great thing with a thing infinitely greater, is what Jesus has given us. He takes us into a world where the cubits do not count. He takes us to 'a place by God,' into the world which is Himself.

That is a truth which men have discovered by experience and have tried to formulate in the doctrine of the Trinity. The truth, namely, that God makes up in Himself what is missing in us. On the first Easter Day, the Risen Lord was made known to Mary in the Garden, to the ten in the locked room, to the two on the way to Emmaus. Mary was a rationalist; she thought He was the gardener. The ten were romanticists; they thought He was a ghost. The two on the road were humanists; they thought He was a fellow-traveller. In each one of these three groups of friends there was something missing, the ability to make the contact between themselves and the Master. Jesus had to supply what they lacked. He had to tell them who He was. He was Himself the Revealed and the Revealer.

And He does that still. Only, since that first Easter Day, there has been a Pentecost when the Christ who worked with men and for them came again as Holy Spirit to work within men. And He does that now. He takes us into that mysterious world of the one God in three Persons, the God who is able to provide us with the holiness whose lack prevents us from holding communion with Him, and so He does for us what we cannot do for ourselves.

'Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?' The moment I give Him my answer: 'I cannot, Lord, I cannot,' that very moment He takes me to Himself, into that world where the cubits of human limitations do not count. For He supplies me with the power I lack, the power to recognize Him here and now and to commune with Him for ever.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Answer to Prejudice.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN HOWAT, B.D., MONIFIETH.

'And Nathanael said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, Come and see.'—Jn 1[46].

Nathanael was a good man, in whom our Lord said there was no guile. Nevertheless, Nathanael had his prejudices. When Philip came to him with the astounding statement that he had found the Messiah, Nathanael was to be excused if he doubted him. Galilee had produced so many Messiahs before and it was hardly likely that this latest claimant to be the nation's deliverer would be any better than those who had fooled their countrymen in the past. We cannot blame Nathanael for receiving Philip's enthusiasm with some measure of reserve. It is no mark of an open and responsive mind that it is ready to accept every fanciful rumour at its face value.

But when Philip went on to say that the Messiah is one, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph, and Nathanael dismissed the whole thing with a sneer, 'Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?' we feel that he was allowing prejudice to get the better of his judgment.

This is a common human failing; it is difficult to avoid it. We read unsavoury reports of juvenile delinquency, and our first unthinking reaction is an unflattering condemnation of modern educational methods. We are deeply stirred by shocking terrorist activities in Jerusalem, and unless we are careful we find ourselves thinking if not saying, 'What else can you expect from these Jews? They are an unscrupulous lot.' We are disturbed by the delays and reverses in the post-war International Conferences, and without any inside information we jump to the conclusion that it must be Russia that is to blame. It may be that any or all of these judgments is true, but the point is we are not justified in making them from the evidence before us. Similarly when Nathanael heard that the new Messiah was from Nazareth, that was enough for him. No Messiah could come out of Nazareth.

Of course it was a surprising thing, a quite unpredictable thing, that the Messiah should come out of Nazareth. Even we, who have no particular bias against Nazareth or its people, can see that. Indeed this prejudice of Nathanael's in its essence has lingered on through the ages and is still with us. That the Son of God, the Creator and Sustainer of the heavens and the earth, should be a carpenter in an out of the way village of Galilee has always been and still is an offence to some and foolishness to others. That the supreme disclosure of the Eternal Being, who is the source of all life and truth, should be bound up with a manger in Bethlehem, a criminal's Cross at Calvary, and the spiritual experience of a few unlearned men in an Upper Room in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, is something disreput-

able. Men protested against it at the beginning. 'Crucify him! crucify him!' shouted the men of Jerusalem. 'We will hear thee again of this matter,' mocked the men of Athens, when St. Paul spoke of it. And we may not like it at all; we may protest against it ourselves; we may wish with all our hearts that it were otherwise.

What is to be done to meet such prejudice? Argument will not dispose of it. There is only one course possible, the one Philip followed, when he said, 'Come and see.'

In the years between the Wars I had frequent dealings with a church office-bearer, who took every possible opportunity to denounce the shiftless, ne'er-do-weel unemployed. Nothing any one suggested could temper his fulminations. It happened, however, that his own brother was thrown out of work. As the months passed he became depressed; his comfortable home became shabby and cheerless; his children, who had always been well clothed and cared for, began to show traces of the hard life they were living. The brother, what of him? From a prejudiced critic, unassailable by any argument, he turned into a sympathetic friend of all who were suffering from lack of work. This intimate personal experience of the harrowing effects of continued unemployment wrought a miracle in his soul.

It is the same with all our prejudices, which by setting the different sections of the community against each other frustrate the work of national reconstruction, and by increasing international suspicion prevent any real advance being made towards a lasting peace. Somehow or other we must be persuaded to come from behind the iron curtain we all erect about ourselves and see.

Nor is it different with that deep-seated prejudice against the content of the Christian revelation that we find on every hand. We must lead people to do what Philip led Nathanael to do. When Nathanael was brought into the presence of Christ, his prejudices vanished and all he could find in his heart to say was, 'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.'

'We preach Christ crucified,' wrote St. Paul, 'unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.' Not so very long before, St. Paul himself had found that same Cross both a stumblingblock and worse than foolishness. But when on the Damascus highway he met the exalted Christ for himself, all that was over and every prejudice was swept out of his soul. 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'

When men come to know the Christian religion from the inside and so surrender themselves to it that it becomes their very life, they find the unbelievable coming true. Surveyed from the outside, at a distance, it offends and repels; it seems the very last thing that thinking men could believe about God. But when they 'come and see,' they realize the wonder of it. They discover that it is good news.

Put Christianity to the test and it will satisfy the test. Do we not all find that? What Nathanael and St. Paul and every other who accepts Christ has found, that the more they give themselves to Him the more they are held by Him. Many a one looking back along the Christian road that he has come can only marvel at what troubled him and vexed his spirit at the outset of the journey. Difficulties that in the early days he never thought he would surmount, puzzling features in the faith that perplexed him—how often has closer acquaintance and deeper experience transformed these into supports upholding the whole structure of his life!

At the very core of Christian worship is the sacrament of Holy Communion. To those outside it must seem the height of folly to believe that eating and drinking bread and wine can lead men and women into intimate spiritual communion with each other and with the Author of life. Perhaps there was a day when we thought so ourselves. But have we not all found that the oftener we obey the Divine command and come to the Holy Table, the deeper in meaning and significance the rite becomes?

God always startles men by the way He works. Our Lord was repeatedly upsetting people by His unconventional behaviour. Even His closest friends were frequently shocked by the things He did. They thought they knew how a Messiah should bear Himself, what He ought to do and what He ought not to do. When He began to speak about going up to Jerusalem to suffer and die at the hands of men, Peter remonstrated with Him, and Jesus turned on him with the words, 'Get thee behind me, Satan.'

Peter thought he knew better than his Master, and that is the real nature of our prejudices. Instead of being willing to learn from God, we try to dictate to God. 'My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord.' So often when God has been seeking to lead His Church by new and unfamiliar paths, men have held back, convinced that these could not be God's way. Perhaps to-day we should try to remember that when we look out somewhat fearfully at the work the Church is being called to do in the new world that is taking shape. Of much that is strange we may be profoundly suspicious. But before we dismiss it all as no 'good thing,' let us accept the invitation of Philip to 'come and see.'

A Ninth Century Life of Christ: The Old Saxon Hêliand.

By the Reverend R. G. Philip, M.A., Balmaclellan, Castle Douglas.

Several Lives of Christ had appeared in Latin, but in course of time the gospel story was bound to appear in other tongues. As Professor W. P. Ker wrote of the Bible: 'One thing may be said with confidence about its part in the Middle Ages: that it could not fail to attract the vernacular and popular languages to imitate and repeat its sublimities as well as they could.' The *Hêliand* (pronounced *Hail-iand*) is a notable example. As an account of the earthly life of Jesus, woven together from the Four Gospels into a single poem, and composed in a language of Western Europe other than Latin, it ranks first in point of time. The *Christ* of Cynewulf does not cover the same ground.

The *Hêliand* was probably composed between A.D. 825 and 835, but author and place are both unknown. We learn the origin, however, from a Latin 'Preface' and 'Verses' included by Matthias Flacius Illyricus in his *Catalogue of Witnesses to the Truth* (2nd, 1562), in which he cites four hundred writers from previous centuries who had explicitly or implicitly rejected the errors of Rome. We learn there that Louis the Pious, son and successor of Charles the Great (Charlemagne) commanded a Saxon already 'reckoned no mean prophet' to prepare a poem for the enlightenment of his countrymen, who had been forced to accept Christianity by Charles after sixteen fierce campaigns; and also that the poet was admonished in a dream to undertake the work.

These Saxons were first called Old Saxons by Bede. They lived chiefly between the Elbe and the Rhine, especially east and west of the Weser. They remained in their Continental home after many from their own and kindred tribes had crossed over to Britain.

Their language is now known as Old Saxon (not Anglo-Saxon), and the *Hêliand* is of first-rate linguistic importance, as it is the only considerable literary monument in the dialect. In the genesis of Western European languages (Teutonic) it stands second only to the famous *Codex Argenteus* (Silver Codex), the Gothic Version of the Gospels translated by Ulfilas.

The *Hêliand* runs to about six thousand lines, in the old alliterative metre. The author may have been a layman—a scôp or minstrel, or a 'religious' man—monk or priest. Both views are held, but he may well have been a Saxon minstrel taken to be educated in a Christian school, where he would become well versed in the gospel narratives and their exposition. He may have written the poem at Fulda, Werden, or elsewhere.

German in its background, it is marked by very interesting local colouring. The description of the marriage at Cana, and of Herod's feast, vividly portrays old German customs. Christ is a King or Prince, and the Apostles are His thanes. The shepherds watching their flocks are transformed into grooms watching their steeds, the horse being the characteristic animal of the country. Sheep are barely mentioned. The forest scenery rises before us when the Wise Men are depicted as travelling through woods, and the scene of the Temptation is laid in the wilds of wood. While the winters were rigorous, the forest glades and meadows in the summer sun would help to foster the description of Paradise as 'Heaven's green woodland mead.'

The *Hêliand* was part of a longer poem embracing the Old Testament as well, but only a 'Genesis Fragment' in the Vatican Library has survived. This is immediately linked with early English Literature, for Genesis B of the 'Cædmon' Genesis is, almost without doubt, a transliteration of that Old Saxon poem. Thereby hangs a tale of a remarkable literary discovery in 1894, confirming a brilliant theory of Professor E. Sievers.

As to copies of the poem, none is mentioned until Melanchthon tells us that Luther had one for a long time, and read it carefully. He adds that the manuscript is now at Leipzig; but it has never been traced. About the same time Flacius (Flacich), as already stated, cites the 'Preface' and 'Verses' in which the writing of the poem is described.

Four manuscripts are extant. Two give only short extracts; they are at Prague (P) and in the Vatican Library (V). The Cottonian (C, *Codex Cottonianus*), the most complete, is one of the most highly prized treasures of the British Museum. It bears a note in the handwriting of Dr. Richard James, Keeper of the Library, saying that it once belonged to Canute (*Liber quondam Canuti regis*). The other extensive manuscript (*M, Codex Monacensis*), very valuable, although with many gaps, has been at Munich.

Originally the poem had no name. It was the first Editor, J. A. Schmeller, who in 1830 published it with the title *Hêliand* (German, *Heiland*, Saviour) as being the name given to Jesus in it. Since then it has been published a number of times. Formerly it was a favourite subject in German higher education. During the Great War, 1914–18, those at the head of the German Student Christian Movement, as I have been informed, put copies of an illustrated modern German translation into the hands of the twenty thousand German-speaking students under arms.

The *Hêliand* does not possess any critical value, but it takes an honourable place in the history of Versions of the New Testament. In the second century a rhetorician named Tatian was won over to the Christian faith, was a hearer of Justin Martyr at Rome, and after Justin's martyrdom became head of the Church there. It is suggested that when he left he would take a Latin Harmony with him to his native Osrhoene (Assyria). Using the four separate Gospels in Greek and this Harmony he would produce a new Harmony in Syriac, largely a faithful reproduction of the Gospels, with certain omissions. It was called *Diatessaron*, and for some two hundred years it was the only form in which the Gospels were read in the Syrian Churches. Then when Tatian fell into disfavour because of Encratite views it was displaced (many copies being destroyed), and forgotten.

The next step was taken by Victor, Bishop of Capua, into whose hands a Latin Harmony came almost by chance, about A.D. 545. Now he had read in Eusebius of Tatian's *Diatessaron* (called there διὰ πέντε), and came to the conclusion that the Latin Harmony was a translation of this.

He read it carefully three times, and also ordered a new copy to be made, in which from the great Latin Bible (Vulgate) prepared by Jerome he in many cases substituted the better Latin in it for the inferior Latin of the Harmony. He may also have had some other Old Latin Text before him. His conjecture was fully confirmed some sixty years ago when an Arabic translation of Tatian was discovered. Whether the Latin Harmony was first or Tatian's *Diatessaron*, all are at least agreed on the close relationship between the two.

Victor's revised edition of the Harmony must have been brought to Britain between 670 and 700 either by Benedict Biscop (whose conspicuous services have not always been sufficiently recognized), or by Ceolfrid, for the great library at Wearmouth, where probably Bede himself perused it.

Then Boniface took it with him on his mission to Friesland and Germany; and it is believed to have been the copy of the New Testament which he held above his head when he received the fatal blow. Probably it has remained ever since in the Library at Fulda, where it now lies, bearing Victor's signature. It is known as the *Codex Fuldensis* (fuld or F). Out of thousands of manuscripts of the Vulgate it is regarded as the second best.

The *Hêliand* is based on all the Gospels, on the Synoptics more than on John, and specially on Matthew. The author has also made use of the commentary of Rabanus Maurus on Matthew, and of other commentaries and books, such as the poems of Alcimus Avitus of Vienne. Like F he sometimes departs from the usual order, as when he transposes the second and third Beatitudes. He has shown great skill in the selection and arrangement of his material. He was bound to omit much, but sometimes his selection is surprising. Out of thirty parables, besides an indication of either one or two others, he gives only five in full, with an interpretation, namely, The Sower, The Wheat and the Tares, The Drag-net, Dives and Lazarus, and The Hours. Even those of Mt 25, and Lk 14 and 15 are omitted. The interviews with Nicodemus, the woman of Samaria, and Zacchæus are absent, not to mention others.

On the other hand, he strikes a modern ethical note by including the Sermon on the Mount almost in full. Here is the description of Christ's attitude before He spoke (lines 1291–1299):

So He sat silent, and looked at them for long,
with gracious heart, the holy Prince
and mild in mood; then He His mouth unlocked,
by words of His the Almighty's Son showed
many a thing to marvel at, and to those men spoke
wise words, to those whom to hold counsel there
He, Christ All-ruling, chosen had,
who were of all men on the earth,
of the whole human kin, dearest to God.

The poet amplifies other incidents also, at times with a certain redundancy, and yet he depicts the gospel scenes and recounts the teaching of Jesus with remarkable fidelity. Here, for example, are the opening lines in which he paints The Transfiguration (lines 3123–3134):

As there He knelt to pray,
up yonder then appeared in other likeness
His form and raiment, a sheen was on His cheeks,
clear as the radiant sky so shone that Son of God,
all full of light the garment of His flesh, rays gleamed
with witching glory from the Almighty's Son, His raiment white
as snow to see. Now was a marvel all uncommon
thereafter set before the eyes: Elias and Moses
came there to Christ, with the One so mighty
converse close to hold. Full winsome was their speech,
right good words passed between the three, where God's Son
with the men of high degree discoursed, as 'twas His will.

The poem is marked by great human interest, and the author shows clear insight into the variety of human temperament and motive. While he often introduces additions from his own imagination, or from outside sources, yet his whole account is in notable agreement with the Gospels. There is no theory of the Atonement, but the Death of Jesus was necessary for man's redemption. It was not a ransom price paid to the devil. Rather, the devil did all he could to ward it off, as he saw that it would deal a shattering blow to his dominion. In this connexion the dream of Pilate's wife holds a special place. The general note running through the *Hêliand* may be thus expressed : the Kingdom of Heaven is for those who are set free by Christ from the tyranny of evil spirits, and who sincerely repent, hearken to His words, and obey the behests of Heaven's King.

The poet's whole treatment of his subject is fresh and vigorous. It is also spacious, and this was fitted to appeal to the Saxons, who loved the open air. One of the phrases describing the Kingdom of Heaven is *unidbredan welon* — the happy ' weal of broad expanse.' The language not infrequently rises into striking felicity and beauty of expression. The didactic element no doubt takes from the quality of pure epic, but yet with its lofty narrative and heroic mood the *Hêliand* is well entitled, as many hold, to be called a great Christian epic.

In conclusion, there is a nationalism in the poem, but it is harnessed to a pure gospel. And so we may wonder when a German will arise, with Christian passion and poetic gift or preaching power, to set before his countrymen, as that Saxon did, the grace and glory of the kingly Christ, and with pristine clearness teach them His ' lovely lore.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Book of Ezekiel. A generation ago there was no book of the Old Testament whose unity and integrity was more widely recognized than the Book of Ezekiel. All that is now changed and in recent years there has been no book that has called forth a greater variety of views. Seventeen years ago Torrey argued that it was a late pseudepigraph placed first in the period of Manasseh, and then revised to transfer it a century later,[1] while James Smith actually dated Ezekiel in the time of Manasseh.[2] Earlier Hölscher had reduced the genuine prophecies of Ezekiel to diminutive proportions,[3] and more recently Herntrich ascribed large parts of the Book to an exilic disciple of Ezekiel, to whom a substantial measure of the Book was ascribed, while Ezekiel himself was believed to have worked in Palestine in the early part of the sixth century B.C.[4] Still more recently Irwin [5] has offered a solution which is scarcely less radical than Hölscher's. Now the Scandinavian scholar, Nils Messel, has offered yet another solution.[6] Owing to the War he had no access to Irwin's work, of which he had probably not even heard, but it is more surprising that he betrays no knowledge of Torrey's.

Like several of the writers just mentioned and others who have been influenced by them, Messel finds a Babylonian background to the book entirely wanting, save in secondary passages which are therefore fictitious. He therefore argues that Ezekiel lived and worked in Palestine, but much later than the editor of the Book would have us believe. Messel holds that the work of Ezekiel followed that of Nehemiah, and belonged to the period *c.* 400 B.C. The *golah* of the Book is not the *golah* living in Babylonia, but the returned exiles, who are contrasted with the people with a continuous Palestinian tradition in the purity of their religion, and particularly in their monotheism. Instead of finding, in the way that is common amongst modern scholars, the degraded Levites of ch. 44 to be the country priests who were displaced by the Deuteronomic reform, but who failed to secure a place beside the Jerusalem priests, Messel holds that they were the Temple priests of Jerusalem, who were reduced in status in their own shrine because of the lack of their purity as compared with the returned priests. It is a pity that Messel says little about Ezra, and does not attempt to relate the work of Ezekiel to Ezra's. It is commonly believed that Ezekiel stands intermediate, on this question of the priesthood, between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code, which Ezra is believed to have promulgated, and it would have been helpful if Messel had discussed the date of Ezra's work and its character in relation to Ezekiel.

The author holds the work of Ezekiel to have been extensively glossed, and the bulk of his book is devoted to an analysis of the entire Book of Ezekiel, in which the work of the glossator is separated from the genuine material. The reviewer is not convinced of the soundness of the theory on which the analysis is based, and finds

[1] *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*, 1930.
[2] *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, 1931.
[3] *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch*, 1924.
[4] *Ezechielprobleme*, 1932.
[5] *The Problem of Ezekiel*, 1943.
[6] *Ezechielfragen* (Dybwad, Oslo ; 1945 ; Kr. 13.00). (Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1945. No. 1).

it very hard to transfer Ezekiel from the sixth century B.C. It is to be noted, however, that the fact that Messel ascribes the Book to so late a point in the post-exilic age does not bring his view into any close relationship with Torrey's. For Messel holds that Ezekiel actually lived in that age, while Torrey—who puts the Book much later than Messel, indeed—makes it a pseudepigraph.

Nomadic Culture and the Old Testament. From Scandinavia comes also a learned and valuable study by a Swedish scholar, Samuel Nyström, dealing with the traces of Bedouin culture in the Old Testament, and its influence on, and conflict with, the religion of Yahwism.[1] After an initial chapter on the nature and ideal of Bedouin culture, resting on a careful study of the standard works on the subject, the author reviews the traces of its characteristic institutions in the Old Testament. Here he discusses the hospitality of the desert, blood revenge, tribal loyalty, the usage of war, and marriage customs. In the course of this chapter the author connects the Arab *'atfa*, which was carried into battle with the prettiest girl inside, with the Israelite Ark, which was also associated with battle, and was believed to promote victory. Though Nyström was unaware of it, this view has recently been fully discussed and developed by the American scholar, Julian Morgenstern, in two long articles in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, which have since been published in book form.[2] The inability of scholars of one country to get access to the work of those of other countries is one of the unhappy legacies of war-time conditions which will probably leave its mark on our studies for a long time.

Nyström next traces the development from nomadic culture through semi-nomadic to settled life, as reflected in the Old Testament, and considers the nature and origin of Yahwism as something distinct from, and in many respects in conflict with, the old Bedouin culture. This chapter is particularly useful, as showing that while much of the old culture was carried forward, it was under the restraint of new ideas to which it was really opposed. In the following chapter the author turns to the pre-exilic prophets, and reviews their reaction against the new dangers that settled life had brought, because of the so different culture with which it was associated, and their yearning for the simplicity of the old ways, in preference to the luxury and social disease of the new—and this despite their reaction against the wilderness as such. In Deuteronomy and the post-exilic prophets, however, we find a growing tendency to idealize the old nomadic period less and less, and to find in it instead a time of darkness and disloyalty.

While there is little that is fundamentally new in this book, it brings out well the triangular nature of the conflict that went on in Israel, particularly in the social sphere. That Israel came into Canaan with a nomadic inheritance, and that there was a long conflict with the agricultural civilization which she assimilated, is frequently noted. But here the distinctive character of Yahwism, itself derived neither from the desert nor from Canaan, but given to her through Moses, is clearly recognized as a third factor. By its own inherent nature it was in conflict with some elements of both the Bedouin and the Canaanite culture.

The Historical Tradition in Israel. Professor E. Jacob, who has recently gone from Montpellier to the Old Testament Chair at Strasbourg, has published a careful study of Old Testament historiography.[3] As his book appeared in France almost simultaneously with Professor North's *Interpretation of History in the Old Testament* in this country, neither writer could take account of the other's work, but the approach of the two authors is sufficiently different to make neither book superfluous to the possessor of the other.

Professor Jacob first reviews in a general way the character of Semitic historiography and its attitude to history. He then turns to examine the pre-literary materials used by the Old Testament writers, and particularly the ancient tales, myths, and legends, and the oral traditions preserved for their use, especially in connexion with religious festivals and rites. It is important that this should be remembered, since it means that the substance of the traditions is carried back far by the tenacity and conservatism of the rites. Following this there is a survey of the channels through which the traditions were transmitted to the writers. Here, *inter alia*, there figure the poets, the priests, the court annalists, and the prophetic circles. The author wisely recognizes also the importance of genealogies in the tradition.

He then turns to review chronologically the historiography of the Old Testament. Here the narratives embedded in the Book of Judges, as distinct from the Deuteronomic editing of those narratives, have first place, followed by the great court history of David, which is ascribed somewhat doubtfully to Abiathar. This leads on to other sources drawn on by the compiler of the Books of Kings.

After thus dealing with some of the principal sources drawn on by the compilers of the historical portions of the Old Testament, Jacob treats of the more systematic works that were compiled on the basis of the oral or written sources he has reviewed. Here the Yahwist occupies the first place, while the Elohist is regarded as a very doubtful independent historiographer, his work, in so far as it can be distinguished from the Yahwist's, being connected with Deuteronomy. In this virtual elimination of the Elohist, Jacob is following Volz and Rudolph, whose followers so

[1] *Beduinentum und Jahwismus: eine soziologisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten Testament* (Gleerup, Lund; 1946; Kr. 10.00).

[2] *The Ark, the Ephod, and the 'Tent of Meeting'* (Hebrew Union College Press, Cincinnati; 1945).

[3] *La tradition historique en Israël* (La Faculté de Théologie Protestante, Montpellier; 1946; Fr. 120).

far have been very few. Next the prophetic cycles are examined, and then the work of the Deuteronomic and Priestly schools, the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the Chronicler's synthesis, while a final chapter on Apocalyptic and the Book of Daniel concludes the work.

Altogether it provides a very useful survey of its field. It is less interested in the philosophy of history and in the theological presuppositions of the writers than Professor North's, but it offers a good assessment of the historical qualities of the various writings it reviews. Its study of the sources behind our present sources is in line with much recent work, while it keeps closer to the way of the critical school of Old Testament scholars than the recent Swedish work of Dr. I. Engnell.[1]

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester.

[1] *Gamla Testamentet*, i. 1945.

Contributions and Comments.

'Lead us not into temptation.'

I HAVE read with interest Mr. E. H. Blakeney's note on this text in the July 1946 number (Matthew vi. 13=Luke xi. 4; cf. Mark xiv. 38). He asks whether the rendering 'ne *patiaris* nos induci' gives the sense required. Evidently it is an attempt to explain a difficult saying, and whether it is the correct explanation or not, its result is the same as the 'tolerative Hiphil' theory.

Some scholars believe that in Matthew's form of the Lord's Prayer the words 'but deliver us from evil' are really the first attempt to explain the preceding petition, 'lead us not into temptation,' and the explanation very early became part of the text. In the Latin tradition the same sort of thing happened. The form of the petition, 'do not allow us to be led into temptation,' is earlier than Cyprian. It appears first in Marcion, who is probably the originator of it. It then found its way into Old Latin Gospels, *i.e.* k and c, by way of Tertullian's use of it, in its Latin form, to explain the usual text (*De Oratione*, 8). Besides Cyprian, Ambrose also has it (*De Sacramentis*, v. 4, 18 and 29, vi. 5, 24), and it was known to Augustine (*De Sermone Domini in Monte*, ii. 9, 30).

For fuller details of this interesting variant and of two others, reference may be made to what I have written in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xlvi. (1945), pp. 179–183.

A. J. B. HIGGINS.

New College, London.

Displacements in the Fourth Gospel.

IN his article, 'Displacements in the Fourth Gospel,' in the May 1946 issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Mr. F. J. Brown declares that he is satisfied neither with Dr. Moffatt's nor with Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor's nor with Mr. Warburton Lewis's theory as to where chs. 15 and 16 of that Gospel should be inserted in ch. 13, and I think rightly so.

There is something to be said for allowing chs. 13–16 to stand as they are, and to regard chs. 14 and 15 as being vitally linked together, after the manner suggested by Dr. Marcus Dods, in *The Expositor's Bible*. 'Like a friend who cannot tear himself away and has many more last words after he has bid us good-bye, Jesus continues speaking to the disciples while they are selecting and putting on their sandals, and girding themselves to face the chill night air.' So Dods. Jesus continues speaking, even after He has said, 'Henceforth I will not talk much with you,' and even after He has said, 'Arise, let us go hence,' Dods says again: 'As He saw their reluctance to move, and the alarmed and bewildered expression that hung upon their faces, He could not but renew His efforts to banish their forebodings and impart to them intelligent courage to face separation from Him.' He therefore goes on to say that He and they can never be separated, for they are one for ever. 'I am the vine, ye are the branches. . . .'

If that be a correct reading of the mind of Jesus, then we lose much by separating chs. 14 and 15, and the question may well trouble us, may not the other displacements suggested by various scholars mean, after all, loss instead of gain? That, again, involves another disturbing possibility, that the whole theory of displacements in the Fourth Gospel may be very far indeed from having so sound a basis as some have supposed.

The last verse of ch. 16, with its triumphant declaration, 'I have overcome the world,' seems a more fitting conclusion to the teaching of the Upper Room than the last verse of ch. 14, that triumphant declaration leading right on to the High Priestly Prayer of our Lord, in which He says, still in the tones of a Victor, 'I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.'

ALEXANDER ROSS.

Free Church College, Edinburgh.

Did Matthew and Luke Use a 'Western' Text of Mark?

PREVIOUS articles that have appeared under this heading are :

(A) Dr. Glasson's ' line of inquiry ' suggesting an affirmative answer to the question (E.T., lv. No. 7).
(B) The present writer's article to supplement the textual evidence cited in (A) (E.T., lvi., No. 2).
(C) Dr. Glasson's notes on (B) (E.T., lvii., No. 2).

The following are notes on (C).

(1) It may be true that Tatian's Diatessaron provides evidence supporting an original ' Western' text if it is in agreement with much wide-spread, early evidence indubitably ' Western.' The researches, however, of Mme. A. Bakker into the text of k, of D. Plooij and C. A. Phillips into the Liège Diatessaron, of A. Vaccari and others into the Italian, of J. R. Harris into the traces of the Diatessaron found even in the Pepysian Gospel Harmony, of P. Essabalian into the traces of it in Armenian MSS. (cf. Krüger's note on F. C. Conybeare, *Z.N.T.W.*, xxiii. 5), quite apart from the fragment of the Diatessaron in Greek found at Dura-Europos and possibly another fragment which is discussed by O. Stegmüller (*Z.N.T.W.*, xxxvii. 223–9) or the evidence of a Tatianic text used by the Manichæans to judge from the documents edited by H. J. Polotsky and by C. R. C. Allberry, would seem to justify the verdict that the ' Diatessaron of Tatian had a profound influence ' on the textual tradition of the Gospels in the West as well as the East, despite Lagrange or Souter.

(2) It is a truism that scribes did not need Tatian's Harmony before them to harmonize for themselves. They copied Matthew's Gospel most frequently and Mark's least ; knowing the Gospel of Matthew (or of Luke) almost by heart, they would harmonize frequently, often unconsciously, the text of Mark when they copied it to make it agree with Matthew or Luke.

(3) An appeal is made in (C) from textual to synoptic criticism. B. H. Streeter, discussing the minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, wrote : ' Since . . . both Matthew and Luke *independently* compress Mark by the omission of unnecessary words or sentences, and since in any sentence only certain words can be spared, they could not avoid frequently concurring in the selection of words to be dispensed with. *Under such circumstances, coincidence in omission calls for no explanation* ' (*Four Gospels*, 180. The italics are his).

(4) If Matthew and Luke had a ' Western recension of Mark, then such a recension was in existence before *c.* A.D. 80, approximately the date of Luke's Gospel, and it must have circulated widely enough for ' Matthew ' to use it about a decade later. But what evidence is there that such a recension was made at all in the first century ?

(5) Dr. Glasson cites again Mk $9^{38ff.}$ to support his suggestion, saying that Mk 9^{38} is omitted by D k as well as by Matthew and Luke ; but D k do not omit the first five Greek words of this verse. If Matthew and Luke used a ' Western ' recension of this verse, they must have made a coincident omission of these words !

(6) Does not Dr. Glasson's theory lead us back to an Ur-Marcus hypothesis in at least that form which suggests that Matthew and Luke used a more ' refined ' text than, say, the Alexandrian text of Mark ? But if so, and especially if the origin of this ' refined ' form is to be traced back to a date earlier than A.D. 80, we should expect it to contain an ending to the Marcan Gospel. If we take the usual view to be correct that the original ending of Mark is lost, are we to suppose that only one copy of Mark existed in its mutilated form until the ' Western ' recension was made and that the ' Western ' scribes left it without an ending for Matthew and Luke to supply one independently ? Even if we take the usual view to be incorrect, we cannot assume that those scribes had the critical acumen of a J. M. Creed, a Professor Lightfoot, or a Dr. Stonehouse, enabling them to conclude that Mark had intended Mk 16^{8} to be the final verse : would they not on the hypothesis suggested have anticipated a Longer Ending ? The farther back we suppose the ' Western ' recension to go in the first century, the more acute the problem grows why Matthew and Luke, if they used such a recension, did not quote the original ending or something very like it, or at least some common source after they passed Mk 16^{8}. All the evidence, however, confirms the view that Matthew's and Luke's copy of Mark ended precisely where ours does according to the purest Alexandrian text. On the usual view that the ' Western ' recension took place in the first half of the second century, the following is the chronological order ; (1) Matthew and Luke used what was more or less ' our ' Mk $1–16^{8}$, not a Western recension. (2) They each added independently an account of the appearances of the Risen Lord. (3) The Longer Ending was added to Mark derived from the Lucan ending supplemented from Matthew's and oral tradition (4) The ' Western ' scribes used the Longer Ending. For it cannot be inferred from Mark alone that the Longer Ending was absent from the ' Western ' text. On Dr. Glasson's view what is the order ?

C. S. C. WILLIAMS.

Merton College, Oxford.

Entre Nous.

John Milton, Englishman.

The essential Englishman is a great creature of God. Of that there is no question. He himself is complacently aware of it; and instinctively regards those who, so he feels, have been denied his privileges with what may vary from a kindly pity to a tolerant contempt.

Other nations are apt to be a little shrilly self-assertive, fussily pressing their claims; thereby revealing that they themselves are not quite certain of them, or at least of their acceptance by outsiders. But the pride of an Englishman is far too deep for that. It does not even occur to him to argue for, or to assert, what is to him a self-evident fact of Nature. A lion is a lion, and not like lesser beasts. An Englishman is an Englishman. And if others were made of lower breeds, well, so the Lord God has ordained. And that is that. And, indeed, he is the heir to a wonderful heritage, and to many signal aptitudes and gifts. And yet, curiously, to this characteristic attitude of his he manages to join a self-criticism, even a self-depreciation. In this he is honest enough. But it is meant for home consumption. And if foreigners take it as seriously as it sounds, they are apt to be surprised. As Calvin put it in a sermon, 'Most men to-day say, "Oh, I am the least of men" and yet mean nothing by it. Though they speak thus, their heart is swollen with pride; and, in fact, if you said to them, "I quite believe it," they would at once flare up in anger.' The Englishman would not flare up in anger. He would regard the other pityingly as a fool. In both these respects there never breathed a more typical Englishman than Milton. Many writers have exulted in their English birth and stock. But no one ever had such a colossal pride in being 'one of God's Englishmen,' one of the race that has been set the task of teaching others, so he unhesitatingly declares, and that has responded to that call. And yet one will not easily come upon sharper and more damaging criticism of his countrymen than Milton repeatedly wrote.

This is made clear to us again in two successive chapters, 'Milton's Faith in England' and 'Disillusion,' in *Milton and the English Mind*, by F. E. Hutchinson, D.Litt., F.B.A. (Hodder and Stoughton; 5s. net). The quotations cited are individually familiar. But in the mass they grow impressive; on one side, and the other.

For the rest, this is a vivid, freshly written and most readable account of John Milton, Englishman. It is strange how certain sayings of a man are remembered and quoted down the centuries; while others, no less characteristic, are forgotten. Every one knows

New *Presbyter* is but old *Priest* writ large.

And in the matter of unlicensed printing Milton was right; and, however grave and real the risks they feared, his opponents were wrong. Yet these men, whom he has so pilloried, had built up a Church, the whole organization of which, under God, rests upon trust in the people, and reliance on the people; and to that faith in them they clung, in spite of disappointments. Whereas Milton himself grew cooler and cooler in his democracy; more and more scornful of the people; can scoff and jeer at them, and favour something uglily like a tyranny; as, on the whole, the best solution of our problems open to us.

His gibe against the others is remembered. His own mature final opinions are conveniently forgotten. And that, too, is characteristically English.

A. J. Gossip.

Children's Sermons.

In his book, *The Public Worship of God*, Dr. Coffin has a delightful long chapter on 'Children and Worship.' He comes down decidedly on the side of having a sermon to children in Divine Service, disposing of the objection that talks to children mar the dignity of public worship with the remark, 'but those (who say so) are not the parents of children.' He sets no restriction on the methods of presenting truth to young people, even going the length of rigging up a mast at the side of the pulpit and running up signals of all kinds! Preachers will be interested in the great variety of series which he suggests. Only two conditions he imposes: one is that there should not be more than six sermons in a series, and the other that no sermon should be more than five minutes.

Here are some of the series (hints are given about treatment and helpful books). What we do in Public Worship; How we got our English Bible; Familiar Hymns and Their Story; How the Gospel was Carried to our Forefathers (Patrick, Columba, Augustine, and others); Great Missionaries; Great Christians (Fra Angelico, Bach, Pasteur); Parables from Nature (Mrs. Gatty); Interruptions; Signals; Characters and Incidents from the Pilgrim's Progress. One thing more Dr. Coffin advises, that the preacher should 'change his gears.' One Sunday he should speak specially to the under sevens, another to the ten-year-olds, and another to the 'teens.'

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland